

Course-Section: SOWK 200 0101  
 Title SOC ISSUES SOC ACTION  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1515  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	443/1639	4.65	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	162/1397	4.90	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	568/1504	4.30	4.48	4.05	4.09	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1311/1635	4.30	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	427/1579	4.47	4.17	4.08	4.14	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	674/1520	4.85	4.78	4.70	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	231/1550	4.85	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	329/1295	4.42	4.07	3.94	4.07	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	316/1398	4.69	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	471/1391	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	369/ 958	4.21	4.06	3.93	4.00	4.21	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 200 0101  
 Title SOC ISSUES SOC ACTION  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1515  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0201  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1516  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	850/1639	4.25	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	748/1639	4.44	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	417/1397	4.33	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	812/1583	4.26	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1092/1532	3.90	4.35	4.01	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	990/1504	4.09	4.48	4.05	4.09	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	0	13	4.41	617/1612	4.43	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.75	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	737/1579	3.94	4.17	4.08	4.14	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	435/1518	4.54	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	750/1520	4.75	4.78	4.70	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	428/1517	4.53	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	614/1550	4.46	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	459/1295	4.30	4.07	3.94	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	599/1398	4.25	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	950/1391	4.34	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	897/1388	4.28	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	307/ 958	4.08	4.06	3.93	4.00	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 20	Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1517  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	2	1	8	9	3.91	1252/1639	4.25	4.53	4.27	4.35	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	567/1639	4.44	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	11	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	749/1397	4.33	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	812/1583	4.26	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	2	2	2	5	7	3.72	1081/1532	3.90	4.35	4.01	4.09	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	958/1504	4.09	4.48	4.05	4.09	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	418/1612	4.43	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.75	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	4	12	2	3.74	1185/1579	3.94	4.17	4.08	4.14	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	2	3	14	4.29	1069/1518	4.54	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1033/1520	4.75	4.78	4.70	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	800/1517	4.53	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	991/1550	4.46	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	6	3	10	3.95	677/1295	4.30	4.07	3.94	4.07	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	5	3	9	3.85	908/1398	4.25	4.56	4.07	4.14	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	9	9	4.25	816/1391	4.34	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	2	5	10	4.05	931/1388	4.28	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	405/ 958	4.08	4.06	3.93	4.00	4.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1517  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8020  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1518  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	572/1639	4.25	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	517/1639	4.44	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	9	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	942/1397	4.33	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	726/1583	4.26	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	6	3	11	4.25	580/1532	3.90	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	329/1504	4.09	4.48	4.05	4.09	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	6	2	12	4.30	756/1612	4.43	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	736/1635	4.95	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1071/1579	3.94	4.17	4.08	4.14	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	720/1518	4.54	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.78	4.70	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	474/1517	4.53	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	424/1550	4.46	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	173/1295	4.30	4.07	3.94	4.07	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	369/1398	4.25	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	471/1391	4.34	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	509/1388	4.28	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	603/ 958	4.08	4.06	3.93	4.00	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8020  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1518  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1519  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	330/1639	4.64	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	292/1397	4.70	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	381/1583	4.39	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	236/1532	4.49	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	275/1504	4.39	4.48	4.05	4.09	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	160/1612	4.61	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	3	4.04	1484/1635	4.68	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	17	6	4.21	714/1579	4.02	4.17	4.08	4.14	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	561/1518	4.58	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1520	4.88	4.78	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	189/1517	4.55	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	156/1550	4.79	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	129/1295	4.62	4.07	3.94	4.07	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	285/1398	4.52	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	429/1391	4.49	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	363/1388	4.53	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	253/ 958	4.21	4.06	3.93	4.00	4.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			



P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	17	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1520  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	430/1639	4.64	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	22	4.83	177/1639	4.63	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	145/1397	4.70	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	434/1583	4.39	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	236/1532	4.49	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	275/1504	4.39	4.48	4.05	4.09	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	19	4.63	364/1612	4.61	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1635	4.68	4.75	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	691/1579	4.02	4.17	4.08	4.14	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	397/1518	4.58	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	648/1520	4.88	4.78	4.70	4.78	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	474/1517	4.55	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	376/1550	4.79	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	247/1295	4.62	4.07	3.94	4.07	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	316/1398	4.52	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	227/1391	4.49	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	363/1388	4.53	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	290/ 958	4.21	4.06	3.93	4.00	4.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1520  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 8020  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: MARSHALL, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1521  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	593/1639	4.64	4.53	4.27	4.35	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	650/1639	4.63	4.56	4.22	4.27	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	632/1397	4.70	4.46	4.28	4.39	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	974/1583	4.39	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	670/1532	4.49	4.35	4.01	4.09	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	945/1504	4.39	4.48	4.05	4.09	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	4	2	14	4.38	656/1612	4.61	4.56	4.16	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1635	4.68	4.75	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	2	9	1	3.64	1245/1579	4.02	4.17	4.08	4.14	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	1085/1518	4.58	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	872/1520	4.88	4.78	4.70	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	964/1517	4.55	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	414/1550	4.79	4.59	4.22	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	243/1295	4.62	4.07	3.94	4.07	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	702/1398	4.52	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	5	2	3	9	3.84	1100/1391	4.49	4.60	4.30	4.35	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	2	3	11	4.05	931/1388	4.53	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	567/ 958	4.21	4.06	3.93	4.00	3.82	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 260 8020  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: MARSHALL, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1521  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0101  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1522  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	860/1639	4.59	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	831/1639	4.57	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	767/1397	4.52	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1289/1583	4.16	4.45	4.19	4.24	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	419/1532	4.45	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	585/1504	4.41	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	934/1612	4.52	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.50	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1318/1579	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	919/1518	4.64	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1136/1520	4.74	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.71	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	991/1550	4.52	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	505/1295	4.16	4.07	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	494/1398	4.55	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.79	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.72	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	577/ 958	3.99	4.06	3.93	3.97	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1523  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	171/1639	4.59	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	163/1639	4.57	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	282/1397	4.52	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	2	16	4.60	371/1583	4.16	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	4	13	4.47	366/1532	4.45	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	351/1504	4.41	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	118/1612	4.52	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.50	4.75	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1579	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	286/1518	4.64	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	546/1520	4.74	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	206/1517	4.71	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	185/1550	4.52	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	3	2	11	4.11	569/1295	4.16	4.07	3.94	3.95	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	329/1398	4.55	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	429/1391	4.79	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	423/1388	4.72	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	386/ 958	3.99	4.06	3.93	3.97	4.19	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1523  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1524  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	330/1639	4.45	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	263/1639	4.54	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	334/1397	4.44	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	363/1583	4.36	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	165/1532	4.33	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	6	20	4.67	245/1504	4.49	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	139/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	529/1635	4.89	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	292/1579	4.04	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	301/1518	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	437/1520	4.78	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	239/1517	4.65	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	376/1550	4.58	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	12	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	894/1295	3.87	4.07	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	166/1398	4.71	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	356/1391	4.65	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	411/1388	4.78	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	430/ 958	3.90	4.06	3.93	3.97	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1524  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1525  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	977/1639	4.45	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	1003/1639	4.54	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	925/1397	4.44	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	1098/1583	4.36	4.45	4.19	4.24	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	981/1532	4.33	4.35	4.01	4.05	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	576/1504	4.49	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	955/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	781/1635	4.89	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	1	5	6	0	3.23	1427/1579	4.04	4.17	4.08	4.07	3.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1196/1518	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	1264/1520	4.78	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	843/1517	4.65	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	867/1550	4.58	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	2	2	1	5	5	3.60	929/1295	3.87	4.07	3.94	3.95	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	532/1398	4.71	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	719/1391	4.65	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	387/1388	4.78	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	779/ 958	3.90	4.06	3.93	3.97	3.36	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 388 8020  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: THIEL, MINDY  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1526  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	2	4	21	4.43	712/1639	4.45	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	252/1639	4.54	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	517/1397	4.44	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	444/1583	4.36	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	7	16	4.39	450/1532	4.33	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	367/1504	4.49	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	259/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	529/1635	4.89	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	601/1579	4.04	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	170/1518	4.63	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1520	4.78	4.78	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	198/1517	4.65	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	23	4.71	401/1550	4.58	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	6	16	4.35	391/1295	3.87	4.07	3.94	3.95	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	183/1398	4.71	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	344/1391	4.65	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	265/1388	4.78	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	2	0	3	6	15	4.23	359/ 958	3.90	4.06	3.93	3.97	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 388 8020  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: THIEL, MINDY  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1526  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1527  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	456/1639	4.66	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	455/1639	4.50	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	705/1397	4.49	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	455/1583	4.65	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	210/1532	4.54	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	351/1504	4.65	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	340/1612	4.66	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1045/1635	4.37	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	657/1579	3.98	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	435/1518	4.60	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	597/1520	4.55	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	360/1517	4.46	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	338/1550	4.60	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	1	1	3	5	3.29	1089/1295	2.74	4.07	3.94	3.95	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	355/1398	4.59	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	670/1391	4.61	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	624/1388	4.43	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	405/ 958	3.98	4.06	3.93	3.97	4.15	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.50	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.45	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1527  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1528  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	430/1639	4.66	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	617/1639	4.50	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	400/1397	4.49	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	217/1583	4.65	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	469/1532	4.54	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	169/1504	4.65	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	317/1612	4.66	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1447/1635	4.37	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1200/1579	3.98	4.17	4.08	4.07	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	891/1518	4.60	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1367/1520	4.55	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	917/1517	4.46	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	716/1550	4.60	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1269/1295	2.74	4.07	3.94	3.95	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	397/1398	4.59	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	368/1391	4.61	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	783/1388	4.43	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.98	4.06	3.93	3.97	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		



Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101  
 Title ADVOCATES PROGRAM  
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1529  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.56	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.46	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.45	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.35	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.48	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.56	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 395 0101  
 Title ADDICTIVE BEHAV PATTER  
 Instructor: DVORAK, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1530  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	293/1639	4.32	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	382/1639	4.18	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	6	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	400/1397	4.01	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	3	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	307/1583	4.24	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	141/1532	4.41	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	150/1504	4.54	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	134/1612	4.65	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1635	4.73	4.75	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	517/1579	3.94	4.17	4.08	4.07	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	720/1518	4.18	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	273/1520	4.69	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	287/1517	4.31	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	338/1550	4.31	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	203/1295	4.59	4.07	3.94	3.95	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	234/1398	4.52	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	136/1391	4.77	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	134/1388	4.89	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	399/ 958	3.83	4.06	3.93	3.97	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.73	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.45	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6



Course-Section: SOWK 395 8020  
 Title ADDICTIVE BEHAV PATTER  
 Instructor: JONES, MICHELE  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1531  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1281/1639	4.32	4.53	4.27	4.28	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1369/1639	4.18	4.56	4.22	4.20	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1300/1397	4.01	4.46	4.28	4.26	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	2	3.80	1226/1583	4.24	4.45	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	774/1532	4.41	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	585/1504	4.54	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	603/1612	4.65	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1175/1635	4.73	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	6	3	1	3.50	1318/1579	3.94	4.17	4.08	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1357/1518	4.18	4.58	4.43	4.39	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1256/1520	4.69	4.78	4.70	4.68	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1211/1517	4.31	4.59	4.27	4.23	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1188/1550	4.31	4.59	4.22	4.20	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	251/1295	4.59	4.07	3.94	3.95	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	625/1398	4.52	4.56	4.07	4.13	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	557/1391	4.77	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	296/1388	4.89	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	725/ 958	3.83	4.06	3.93	3.97	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1532  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	214/1639	4.86	4.53	4.27	4.28	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	295/1639	4.71	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.46	4.28	4.26	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	281/1583	4.71	4.45	4.19	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1504	4.86	4.48	4.05	4.12	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1612	4.83	4.56	4.16	4.12	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.66	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.17	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.59	4.22	4.20	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.07	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.62	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.06	3.93	3.97	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 470 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1533  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	517/1639	4.28	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	517/1397	4.31	4.46	4.28	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	597/1583	4.34	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	535/1532	4.28	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	568/1504	4.21	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	388/1612	4.13	4.56	4.16	4.18	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.84	4.75	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.26	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	891/1518	4.41	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.63	4.78	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	674/1517	4.25	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	580/1550	4.34	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	746/1295	3.91	4.07	3.94	4.01	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	260/1398	4.20	4.56	4.07	4.23	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	4.18	4.60	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	4.32	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	411/ 958	3.35	4.06	3.93	4.24	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 6
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 470 8020  
 Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH  
 Instructor: TING, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1534  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	2	0	2	1	11	4.19	964/1639	4.43	4.53	4.27	4.42	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	1044/1639	4.28	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	0	2	2	10	4.13	916/1397	4.31	4.46	4.28	4.38	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	761/1583	4.34	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	571/1532	4.28	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	4	9	4.13	747/1504	4.21	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1327/1612	4.13	4.56	4.16	4.18	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	979/1635	4.84	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1214/1579	4.26	4.17	4.08	4.21	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	978/1518	4.41	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	1352/1520	4.63	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	1048/1517	4.25	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	0	2	1	10	4.13	1000/1550	4.34	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	2	0	3	0	8	3.92	709/1295	3.91	4.07	3.94	4.01	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	2	3	6	3.64	1045/1398	4.20	4.56	4.07	4.23	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1260/1391	4.18	4.60	4.30	4.48	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	0	1	5	5	3.64	1139/1388	4.32	4.62	4.28	4.50	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	4	1	0	3	1	2.56	912/ 958	3.35	4.06	3.93	4.24	2.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1535  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.56	4.53	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	170/1639	4.73	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1397	4.45	4.46	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	270/1583	4.67	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	774/1532	4.16	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	176/1504	4.70	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	656/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.18	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	869/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1579	4.33	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.78	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	156/1550	4.73	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1295	3.63	4.07	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	211/1398	4.78	4.56	4.07	4.23	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1391	4.84	4.60	4.30	4.48	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1388	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.50	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	290/ 958	4.45	4.06	3.93	4.24	4.36	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.73	4.73	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	4.45	4.45	4.05	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		



Course-Section: SOWK 481 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1536  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	188/1639	4.56	4.53	4.27	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	170/1639	4.73	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.45	4.46	4.28	4.38	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	217/1583	4.67	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	2	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	525/1532	4.16	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	67/1504	4.70	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	123/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.18	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	766/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	241/1579	4.33	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	491/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.91	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	222/1517	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	338/1550	4.73	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	12	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1295	3.63	4.07	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	205/1398	4.78	4.56	4.07	4.23	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	380/1391	4.84	4.60	4.30	4.48	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	307/1388	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.50	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	4	0	11	4.47	227/ 958	4.45	4.06	3.93	4.24	4.47	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	4.73	4.73	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 53	4.45	4.45	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 42	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 37	4.45	4.45	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 32	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1536  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0301  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: TING, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1537  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1252/1639	4.56	4.53	4.27	4.42	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	748/1639	4.73	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1268/1397	4.45	4.46	4.28	4.38	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	741/1583	4.67	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	4	2	10	4.00	774/1532	4.16	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	491/1504	4.70	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	1	13	4.20	882/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.18	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1039/1579	4.33	4.17	4.08	4.21	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	7	11	4.35	1000/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	992/1520	4.91	4.78	4.70	4.75	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	674/1517	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	14	4.40	769/1550	4.73	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	6	1	5	2	4	2.83	1209/1295	3.63	4.07	3.94	4.01	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	349/1398	4.78	4.56	4.07	4.23	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	290/1391	4.84	4.60	4.30	4.48	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	411/1388	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.50	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	2	2	3	10	4.06	446/ 958	4.45	4.06	3.93	4.24	4.06	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	4.73	4.73	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	4.45	4.45	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 37	4.45	4.45	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0301  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: TING, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1537  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 481 8020  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1538  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	508/1639	4.56	4.53	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	156/1639	4.73	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	4.45	4.46	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	160/1583	4.67	4.45	4.19	4.31	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	506/1532	4.16	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	245/1504	4.70	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	186/1612	4.56	4.56	4.16	4.18	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	529/1635	4.88	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	0	0	3	6	4.00	889/1579	4.33	4.17	4.08	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	170/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.78	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	242/1550	4.73	4.59	4.22	4.24	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	329/1295	3.63	4.07	3.94	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	189/1398	4.78	4.56	4.07	4.23	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	181/1391	4.84	4.60	4.30	4.48	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	276/1388	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.50	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	60/ 958	4.45	4.06	3.93	4.24	4.93	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	25/ 52	4.73	4.73	4.04	4.84	4.73	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	22/ 53	4.45	4.45	4.05	4.58	4.45	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.71	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	25/ 37	4.45	4.45	4.58	4.73	4.45	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	17/ 32	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.64	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			