Title SOC ISSUES SOC ACTION

Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 1521 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	816/1649	4.38	4.57	4.28	4.29	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	510/1648	4.54	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.63	4.27	4.37	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	5	14	4.21	747/1512	4.21	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	109/1623	4.92	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	15	8	4.35	1333/1646	4.35	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	801/1621	4.16	4.37	4.06	4.01	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	967/1572	4.74	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	244/1564	4.83	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	475/1559	4.70	4.64	4.29	4.33	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	4	4	14	4.30	482/1352	4.30	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	2	17	4.62	530/1382	4.62	4.76	4.29	4.19	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.73	4.30	4.21	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	4	2	3	4	6	3.32	784/ 948	3.32	4.17	3.95	3.89	3.32
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	***	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	***	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.33	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.55	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****

Title SOC ISSUES SOC ACTION

Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1521 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Title Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1522

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	803/1649	4.49	4.57	4.28	4.29	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	161/1648	4.75	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4		****/1375	4.88	4.63	4.27	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	144/1595	4.85	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	342/1533	4.31	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	263/1512	4.68	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	199/1623	4.75	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1092/1646	4.69	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	687/1621	4.37	4.37	4.06	4.01	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.83	344/1568	4.91		4.43	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1572	4.98	4.88	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	310/1564	4.80	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	573/1559	4.75	4.64	4.29	4.33	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	126/1352	4.82	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	388/1384	4.56	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.19	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	594/1368		4.73	4.30	4.21	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	170/ 948	4.25	4.17	3.95	3.89	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	***	2.04	4.29	4.33	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	72/ 288	4.20	3.31	3.68	3.65	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	4.55	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1522 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-		_	
				?	0						

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22

24

Page 1523 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

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

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1523 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Title Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment:

25 Questionnaires: 25 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1524 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1649	4.49	4.57	4.28	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	202/1648	4.75	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	10	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1375	4.88	4.63	4.27	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	80/1595	4.85	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	443/1533	4.31	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	128/1512	4.68	4.50	4.10	4.14	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	913/1646	4.69	4.83	4.69	4.63	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	133/1621			4.06	4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1568	4.91	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1572		4.88	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	244/1564	4.80	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	227/1559	4.75	4.64	4.29	4.33	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	61/1352	4.82	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	105/1384	4.56	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1382	4.67	4.76	4.29	4.19	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	295/1368	4.62	4.73	4.30	4.21	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	385/ 948		4.17	3.95		4.15
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	1	4	0		****/ 288	4.20	3.31	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	

I 0 Other 14

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 34

Fall 2008

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1525 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8 8 9	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 1 1	4 4 2	6 6 7	15 14 14	4.31 4.19 4.28	966/1648 780/1375	4.48 4.19 4.27	4.57 4.58 4.63	4.28 4.23 4.27	4.29 4.25 4.37	4.31 4.19 4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8 9 9 10	0 0 0	0 1 1 0	2 2 0 1	1 1 3 1	9 6 6 6	15 15 16	4.54	709/1595 594/1533 564/1512 459/1623	4.33 4.28 4.32	4.61 4.34 4.50 4.67	4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16	4.22 4.04 4.14 4.21	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture	9 12	0	0 2	0	0 4	1	24 8		266/1646 1151/1621	4.81 4.02	4.83 4.37	4.69 4.06	4.63 4.01	
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 	9 9 9 9	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 2 2	2 0 0 0 1	0 1 4 2 3	6 3 7 4	17 21 17 14 14	4.52 4.80 4.40 4.24 4.13	840/1572 780/1564 980/1559	4.77 4.23 4.24	4.74 4.88 4.67 4.64 4.24	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.73 4.27 4.33 4.07	
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	16 16 16 16	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 1	5 3 3		4.83 4.83	367/1384 312/1382 337/1368 133/ 948	4.74 4.73	4.58 4.76 4.73 4.17	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	3.99 4.19 4.21 3.89	
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 555	***	2.04	4.29	4.33	***
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.65	***
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	***
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	***
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	uency	Dist	trib		n asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	9
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 P 0		Ele	nera:	_				1	Under-g: #### - I response	Means t		re not	_	25 h
I 0 ? 1		Oth	her				1	.9						

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: JANI, JAYSHREE

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1526 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 541		General		1- 1	-	0	0	0	0	_	0.0	4 00	074/1640	4 40	4 57	4 00	4 00	4 00
_	-	insights,skil or make clear			7 7	0	0	0	0 2	5 8	20 15	4.80	274/1649 533/1648	4.48 4.19	4.57 4.58	4.28	4.29 4.25	4.80 4.52
		stions reflect			8	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.52	480/1375	4.19	4.63	4.23	4.25	4.52
	_	tions reflect	_	-	7	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	428/1595	4.35	4.61	4.20	4.22	4.56
				it you learned	7	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	350/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.52
				hat you learned	7	0	0	1	1	8	15	4.48	408/1512	4.28	4.50	4.10		4.48
	-	system clearly		-	8	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	568/1623	4.32	4.67	4.16	4.21	4.46
		as class cance	_	···	8	0	0	0	0	1		4.96	332/1646	4.81	4.83	4.69		4.96
_				g effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	12	6	4.26	676/1621	4.02	4.37	4.06		4.26
		Lecture	9															
1. Were the	instruct	tor's lectures	s well pre	pared	10	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	535/1568	4.42	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.73
2. Did the	instructo	or seem intere	ested in t	he subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	296/1572	4.77	4.88	4.70	4.73	4.96
3. Was lect	ure mate	rial presented	d and expl	ained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	511/1564	4.23	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.64
		contribute to	_		10	0	0	0	1	3		4.77	361/1559	4.24	4.64	4.29	4.33	4.77
5. Did audi	ovisual t	techniques enl	nance your	understanding	11	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	240/1352	4.03	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.62
		Discus																
				it you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2		4.68	310/1384	4.50	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.68
				o participate	13	0	0	0	2	1		4.74	414/1382	4.74	4.76	4.29	4.19	4.74
		_		pen discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	327/1368	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.21	4.84
4. Were spe	cial tech	nniques succes	sstul		13	7	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	413/ 948	4.21	4.17	3.95	3.89	4.08
		Laborat	-															
5. Were req	uirements	s for lab repo	orts clear	ly specified	30	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.33	***
		Semina	<u>-</u>															
				nounced theme	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
5. Were cri	teria for	r grading made	clear		28	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.65	****
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did conf	erences l	nelp you carry	out fiel	d activities	29	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 312	***	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were the	re enough	n proctors for	all the	students	30	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ear	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	 1	A 10		Poo		ed fo				2	Graduat		0	Majo		17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		ved	1u116	=u (J∓ 141¢	זטנג	b	4	Graduati	=	U	ria JC	,_	Δ/
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	neral	1				1	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		JCI	-C- U	-				_	onacı 'g.			14011		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
	-		-	P 0									response				_	•
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	9	_		3			
				? 1														

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Questions

Instructor: LOVE, YVONNA Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1527 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

		 Genera	 1																	
		ew insights,ski	lls from			8	0	1	1	3	2	15	4.32	898/	1649	4.48	4.57	4.28	4.29	4.32
		ctor make clear				8	0	1	0	9	3	9		1262/		4.19		4.23	4.25	3.86
	_	uestions reflec				8	0	1	2	5				992/				4.27		
		uations reflect	_			8	0	1	0	7				970/		4.35	4.61		4.22	
	_	eadings contrib		-		8	0	2	1	1				688/			4.34		4.04	
		signments contr		-	arned	8	0	2	1	5				883/		4.28		4.10	4.14	
		g system clearl		ined		8	0	1	2	5 0				1104/			4.67		4.21	
	-	was class canc		EE	1	9	2	0	0	5	10 4			1175/			4.83		4.63 4.01	
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	grade the overa	II Leaci	ning effective	eness l	14	2	U	U	Э	4	5	4.00	914/	1021	4.02	4.37	4.06	4.01	4.00
1 Wassa +1	h a . d a a a a a a a	Lectur uctor's lecture				10	0	1	1	4	5	9	4 00	1279/	1 0	4 40	1 71	4.43	4.39	4.00
		ctor seem inter	-			10	0	1	0	1				1193/			4.74			4.55
		terial presente					0	3	0	4	<i>3</i>			1340/			4.67		4.73	
		es contribute t			LIY	9	0	2	1	6				1301/			4.64		4.33	
		l techniques en			ding	9	0	4	2		5								4.07	
		Discus	gion																	
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib		what vou lear	ned	9	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	708/	1384	4.50	4.58	4.08	3.99	4.19
		nts actively en				8	0	1	1	0				511/			4.76		4.19	
		ctor encourage				8	0	0	2	0				654/			4.73		4.21	
		echniques succe				8	5	1	4	0	4			569/					3.89	3.82
5. Were re	equireme	Labora nts for lab rep	_	early specifie	ed 2	28	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	555	***	2.04	4.29	4.33	***
		Semina																		
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad			2	25	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/	288	****	3.31	3.68	3.65	***
		Field																		
5. Did con	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activitie	es 2	25	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	312	****	3.01	3.68	3.59	****
		Self		_																
5. Were th	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all th	he students	2	27	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/	110	****	4.00	3.99	3.72	****
					Frequer	ncy	Dist	ribu	ution	1										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gi	rades				Rea	son	5				Тур	e			Majors	5
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11			Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	Gra	 duate	·	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5																
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 3			Gen	nera:	L				0	Und	er-gr	ad 3	30	Non-	-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0			Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0						enoug	gh
				P 0									_	res	ponse	s to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0			Ot.h	102				1	Ω							
				5 0			OC1.	ICI				_	2							

Course-Section:	SOWK 260H 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1528
Title	INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	BAFFOUR, TIFFAN	Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029

Co Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN Enrollment: 5

	~					
Questionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

was serviced as a serviced ser	OULDO			,,, X,		- 0 - 1 - 1 - 0								
			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.33	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.65	****
Fre	quency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s 			Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe 			Majors	

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

Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Instructor: RUBIN, ANDREA D

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1529 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	1	0	4	1.0	4 52	602/1640	4 50	4 57	4 00	4 07	4 52
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	603/1649		4.57	4.28	4.27	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	3	11 11	4.60 4.73	441/1648 321/1375		4.58 4.63	4.23 4.27	4.18	4.60 4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.73	806/1595		4.63	4.27	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	7	1	4		1362/1533		4.34	4.20	4.05	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	522/1512			4.10	4.11	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.40			4.50	4.16	4.11	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	7	8		1166/1646			4.69	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	6	6		731/1621					4.21
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	J	U	U		1	U	U	7.21	731/1021	1.11	4.57	4.00	1.02	7.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	4.71	4.88	4.70	4.64	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	651/1564	4.64	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	536/1559	4.68	4.64	4.29	4.23	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	440/1352	4.36	4.24	3.98	3.97	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	376/1384	4.68	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	342/1382		4.76	4.29	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	306/1368		4.73	4.30	4.39	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	811/ 948			3.95		3.20
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	0	•	0	-	F 00	***** (0.42	als als als als	de de de de	4 10	2 00	ale ale ale ale
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243		****	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	519/ 555	2.35	2.04	4.29	4.22	2.20
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	260/ 288	2.40	3.31	3.68	3.58	2.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39		4.55	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	278/ 312		3.01	3.68	3.60	2.60
3. Bid conferences help for early one field decivities	13	-	-	Ü	-	_	Ü	2.00	2707 312	2.00	3.01	3.00	3.00	2.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.05	****

Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County RUBIN, ANDREA D Fall 2008

Page 1529 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Title Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1530 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Freq				cies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
× 4 4 5 4 5 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	2	1	2	15	4.50	644/1649	4.52	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	533/1648	4.56	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2		4.71	347/1375	4.72		4.27	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	_		4.55	440/1595	4.41		4.20	4.21	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	4	3		4.45	432/1533	3.86	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	3		4.29	651/1512	4.34		4.10	4.11	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	2		4.38	659/1623	4.49	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.38
		0	0	0	0	5								
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0				15	4.75	913/1646	4.64	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	U	U	0	2	1	12	4.67	234/1621	4.44	4.37	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	588/1568	4.71	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	17		1034/1572	4.71	4.74	4.43	4.59	4.70
	5	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	294/1564	4.71	4.67		4.25	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					2									
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.72	434/1559	4.68	4.64	4.29	4.23	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	U	1	U	3	2	13	4.37	432/1352	4.36	4.24	3.98	3.97	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	247/1204	1 60	/ E0	4 00	4.11	4.75
			•	0		0			247/1384	4.68	4.58	4.08		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0		1	-	16	4.88	262/1382	4.84	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	158/1368	4.90	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	193/ 948	3.87	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.53
Laboratory														
Laboratory	0.0	0	0	-	0	_	_	0 00	**** / 043	****	****	4 10	2 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243			4.12	3.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	511/ 555	2.35	2.04	4.29	4.22	2.50
Quantum and														
Seminar	0.2	0	0	1	0	^	^	0 00	**** 00	****	****	4 - 4	4 62	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 88	****		4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85		****	4.47	4.55	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 288	2.40	3.31	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work			•		•	_					4 0			
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.55	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 312	2.60	3.01	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced	0.0	•			•	_	_	4 00		44	44.	4 22	4 00	4.4.1
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.05	****

Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1530 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 387 0101 Title

POL/PROG/SERV: CHILDREN

Instructor: DEMIDENKO, MICH

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1531 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 541		General		4.1a.2	0	0	^	0	0	0	1 1	F 00	1 /1 6 4 0	F 00	4 57	4 00	4 07	F 00
		w insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1649 1/1648	5.00 5.00	4.57 4.58	4.28	4.27 4.18	5.00 5.00
		estions reflect			0	1	1	0	0	•		4.62	,	4.62	4.63			4.62
	_	ations reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.61	4.20	4.21	5.00
		adings contribu	_	_	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.34			4.43
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	88/1512	4.93	4.50	4.10	4.11	
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	_		4.93	97/1623	4.93	4.67	4.16		4.93
		was class cance	-	icu	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			ng effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	-		4.92	75/1621					
J. 110W WOO	ara you g	rade che overar	.i ccaciii	ing cricociveness	_	O	Ü	Ü	O	_		1.72	7371021	1.52	1.57	1.00	1.02	1.72
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	sted in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	l and exp	lained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.67	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what yo	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.64	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	ance you	ır understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	142/1352	4.79	4.24	3.98	3.97	4.79
		Discuss																
		ssions contribu			0	0	0	0	0				175/1384	4.86	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.86
		ts actively end			0	0	0	0	1			4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.79
				open discussion	0	0	0	0	0			4.93		4.93	4.73	4.30		4.93
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	302/ 948	4.36	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.36
		- 1																
		Laborat	-			•		•	_								4 00	
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	rts clea	rly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	Τ	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar																
E Word ar	ritorio f	or grading made			11	1	1	0	0	1	Λ	2 50	****/ 288	****	3.31	2 60	2 50	****
5. Wele Ci	iteria i	or grading made	Clear		11			U	U		U	2.50	/ 200		3.31	3.00	3.30	
		Field W	Iork															
5. Did con	ferences	help you carry		eld activities	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.60	****
3. Dia 001.	1101011000	noip you ourly	040 110	.14 4001710105		_	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	2.00	, 312		3.01	3.00	3.00	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	\$			Tyl	pe			Majors	
00 27	1	11			~~					0	Graduat		0	Mo i o		11		
	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1						4urr.e	ed fo	т ма	ıjor	D	U	GI aduat	=	U	Majo)T	ΤŢ
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Cor	nera.	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non	major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gel	лета.	L				ı	onder-g.	Lau I	. T	NOII-	ma jor	3
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0							<i>r</i> es				1	#### - I	Meane +	here =	re not	enoua	h
Grau.	J	P 0		T- C		CD				-	response				_			
				I O		Otł	ner					7	I CSPOIIS	L	.c bigin	Cai.		
				? 0		0.01						•						
				. •														

University of Maryland Page 1532
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 38
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101

HUMAN BEHAVIOR

OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Title

Instructor:

	Frequencies Instruc NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean							_	Course	_	UMBC		Sect	
Questions	NR 	NA			3	- 4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	1	1	2	23	4.74	339/1649	4.60	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	182/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	199/1375		4.63	4.27	4.22	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	2	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	144/1595	4.57	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	146/1533	4.51	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	133/1512	4.51	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	130/1623		4.67	4.16	4.08	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	10	16		1092/1646		4.83	4.69	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	356/1621	4.19	4.37	4.06	4.02	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	273/1568		4.74	4.43	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	237/1572		4.88	4.70	4.64	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	206/1564		4.67	4.28	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	22	4.79	332/1559		4.64	4.29	4.23	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	15	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1352	3.82	4.24	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	326/1384	4.60	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	383/1382	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	369/1368		4.73	4.30	4.39	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	234/ 948	4.32	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.47
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92		****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39		4.44	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	4.55	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101
Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

39

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1532 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1533

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201

21

HUMAN BEHAVIOR

WIECHELT, SHELL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructo: Rar		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General	 I																
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	803/1	1649	4.60	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.39
		tor make clear			3	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	797/1	1648	4.67	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.33
		estions reflect			3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	334/1	1375	4.75	4.63	4.27	4.22	4.72
4. Did othe	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	3	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	853/1	1595	4.57	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.22
5. Did assi	igned rea	adings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	5	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	505/1	1533	4.51	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.38
6. Did writ	ten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	5	0	0	3	0	3	10	4.25	687/1	1512	4.51	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.25
		system clearly	-	ned	5	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	370/1		4.72	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.63
_		was class cance			5	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		1646	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How woul	ld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	9	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1345/1	1621	4.19	4.37	4.06	4.02	3.50
		Lecture	9																
1. Were the	e instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	4	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	1183/1	1568	4.67	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.18
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	1096/1	1572	4.86	4.88	4.70	4.64	4.65
3. Was lect	ture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1064/1	1564	4.61	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.13
		s contribute to	_		4	0	0	2	1	7	7		1067/1			4.64	4.29		4.12
5. Did audi	lovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	5	2	3	1	3	5	2	3.14	1195/1	1352	3.82	4.24	3.98	3.97	3.14
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did clas	ss discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	613/1	1384	4.60	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.33
2. Were all	l studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	464/1	1382	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.69
3. Did the	instruc	tor encourage f	Eair and	open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	426/1	1368	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.75
4. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful		5	2	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	415/	948	4.32	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.07
		Laborat	cory																
2. Were you	ı provid		_	round information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were req	quiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	555	****	2.04	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	_																
1 Were ass	signed to			announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
				vidual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
				hat you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
		ns contribute t			19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
		or grading made		•	17	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/	288	****	3.31	3.68	3.58	****
		Field W	Jowle																
3 Was the	instruc	tor available f		ultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	39	****	4.44	4.47	4.43	****
				eld activities	17	0	0	0	0	4	0		****/			3.01	3.68	3.60	****
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1											•						
	F					Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
Credits Ear	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3				Tyj	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						 quire		 or Ma		 s	0	Grad	duat		0	Majo		14
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 9					1/6/	40116	-u 10	J. 1110	בטנ ג	D	U	Grac	Juali	-	J	Majo	_	TI
56-83						Gei	neral	l				0	Unde	er-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	7
84-150 Grad.	01 100 0 0.00 0.10 1					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	####	# - I	Means t	here a	ire not	enouc	rh
<u> </u>	Ŭ	2.20 1.00	-	P 0											es to b			_	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	4							

? 0

Course-Section: SOWK 388 8620 University of Maryland Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR Baltimore County

Instructor: THIEL, MINDY Fall 2008

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 28

Page 1534 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	Ο	0	2	4	18	4.67	433/1649	4.60	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	202/1648	4.67	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	401/1375	4.75	4.63	4.27	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	383/1595	4.57	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	535/1533	4.51	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	479/1512	4.51	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	333/1623	4.72	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	332/1646	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	339/1621	4.19	4.37	4.06	4.02	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	123/1568	4.67	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	296/1572	4.86	4.88	4.70	4.64	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	234/1564	4.61	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1559	4.64	4.64	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	0	1	1	18	4.50	303/1352	3.82	4.24	3.98	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	21	4.79	210/1384	4.60	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	122/1382	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	337/1368	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	2	0	7	14	4.43	257/ 948	4.32	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	****	4.16	4.07	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.22	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.55	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	***	4.00	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: SOWK 388 8620
Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
Instructor: THIEL, MINDY

29

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1534 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	0						

Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 38

OKUNDAYE, JOSHU Fall 2008

Page 1535 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

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

Frequencies

Instructor

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

General General General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 20 0 0 0 0 2 4 12 4.56 577/1649 4.56 4.57 4.28 4.23 3 10 d the instructor make clear the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 2 3 13 4.61 427/1648 4.61 4.58 4.23 3 10 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 267/1649 4.61 4.58 4.23 4.10 d the exam questions reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 267/1549 4.28 4.38 4.34 4.04 6.10 d assigned readings contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4 4.72 189/1533 4.72 4.61 4.20 5.10 d assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 3 1 4 4.72 189/1533 4.72 4.51 4.34 4.04 6.10 d assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 217/1512 4.72 4.50 4.10 6.10 d written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4 4.78 189/1623 4.78 4.67 4.16 6.10 d written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 7 4.94 388/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 9.10 d would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 585/1621 4.33 4.73 4.06 6.10 d written instructor's lectures well prepared 21 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.33 585/1621 4.33 4.73 4.06 6.10 d written instructor's lectures well prepared 21 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.33 585/1621 4.33 4.73 4.06 6.10 d written instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.94 385/1672 4.94 4.88 4.70 6.10 d written assignments contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.05 580/1546 4.56 4.67 4.28 6.10 d written assignments contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 5 1.0 4.00 6.00 6.10 4.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.10 6.00 6.00 6.00 6
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 20 0 0 0 0 2 4 12 4.56 577/1649 4.56 4.57 4.28 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 20 0 0 0 2 3 13 4.61 427/1648 4.61 4.58 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 4 5 9 4.28 788/1375 4.28 4.63 4.27 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 263/1595 4.72 4.61 4.20 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 263/1595 4.72 4.61 4.20 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 198/1533 4.72 4.54 4.04 4.65 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 217/1512 4.72 4.50 4.10 4.04 4.65 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 20 0 0 0 0 2 4 12 4.56 577/1649 4.56 4.57 4.28 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 20 0 0 0 2 3 13 4.61 427/1648 4.61 4.58 4.23 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 4 5 9 4.28 788/1375 4.28 4.63 4.27 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 263/1595 4.72 4.61 4.20 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 198/1533 4.72 4.34 4.04 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 217/1512 4.72 4.50 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 217/1512 4.72 4.50 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 20 0 0 0 0 1 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.28 4.50 did the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.28 4.50 did the lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 5 5 3.75 ****/1352 **** 4.24 3.98 5. Did take lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 5 5 3.75 ****/1352 **** 4.24 3.98 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 4.08 4.09 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 4 5 9 4.28 788/1375 4.28 4.63 4.27 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 263/1595 4.72 4.61 4.20 5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 198/1533 4.72 4.34 4.04 4.6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 3 14 4.72 198/1533 4.72 4.34 4.04 4.6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.72 198/1533 4.72 4.34 4.04 4.6 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.85 4.65 4.10 4.10 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 20 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 1 4 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.06 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 3 3 14 4.72 198/1533 4.72 4.34 4.04 6.5 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 217/1512 4.72 4.50 4.10 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.67 4.16 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 1 4 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.43 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 27 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.43 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 27 0 0 0 1 1 6 5 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.06 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 28 1 2 0 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching expansion 20 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 5 13 4.72 217/1512 4.72 4.50 4.10 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 20 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.67 4.16 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 20 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 20 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 7. Was would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 7. Was would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 7. Was would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 7. Was would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 7. Was would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 7. Was would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
New State grading system clearly explained 20 0 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 199/1623 4.78 4.67 4.16 20 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 4.80 Many times was class cancelled 20 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 4.80 Many times was class cancelled 20 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 21 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 Mere the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 14 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.43 4.20 1.00 Mere the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.28 Mere the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 590/1564 4.56 4.67 4.28 Mere the instructor seem interested in the subject 22 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 4.28 Mere in the instructor seem interested in the subject 22 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.95 590/1564 4.56 4.67 4.28 Mere in the instructor seem interested in the subject 22 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.95 590/1564 4.56 4.67 4.28 Mere in the instructor seem interested in the subject 22 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 487/1559 4.69 4.64 4.29 Mere in the instructor seem interested in the subject 22 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 487/1559 4.69 4.64 4.29 Mere all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 Mere all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 Mere special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 Mere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 Mere distributed for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Mere criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 Mere there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 Mere there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 Mere there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 Mere there enough proctors for al
8. How many times was class cancelled 20 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 398/1646 4.94 4.83 4.69 . How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.37 4.06 . Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 21 0 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.43 . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 590/1564 4.56 4.67 4.28 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 487/1559 4.69 4.64 4.29 . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 8 1 2 0 0 5 3.75 ****/1352 **** 4.24 3.98 . Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 . Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 . Laboratory Seminar Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 . Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 . Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Seminar *** Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced
Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did the instructor encouraged to participate Were all students actively encouraged to participate Were special techniques successful Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Were requirements for grading made clear Were criteria for grading made clear Self Paced Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 21
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 21 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.43 . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22 0 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 590/1564 4.56 4.67 4.28 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 487/1559 4.69 4.64 4.29 . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 8 1 2 0 0 5 3.75 ****/1352 **** 4.24 3.98 . Discussion . Discussion . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 . Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 . Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 . Seminar . Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 21 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 667/1568 4.65 4.74 4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 0 1 16 4.94 355/1572 4.94 4.88 4.70 8.4 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 590/1564 4.56 4.57 4.28 8.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 8 1 2 0 0 5 5 11 4.69 487/1559 4.69 4.64 4.29 9 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 **** Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 948 **** 3.31 3.68 **** Each of the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.70 4.29 9 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 9 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 590/1564 4.56 4.67 4.28 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 5 11 4.69 487/1559 4.69 4.64 4.29 . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 8 1 2 0 0 5 3.75 ****/1352 **** 4.24 3.98 . Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 . Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 . Laboratory Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 . Seminar Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 . Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 . Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Did the contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did class discussions discussion of Did conferences help what you learned Did class discussions discussion of Did conferences help what you learned Did class discussion discussion of Did conferences Did class discussion discussion discussion of Did conferences Did class
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 Laboratory Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 Seminar Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 Laboratory Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 Seminar Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 0 0 3 9 4.21 697/1384 4.21 4.58 4.08 . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 . Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 . Laboratory Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 . Seminar Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 . Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 . Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 292/1382 4.86 4.76 4.29 . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 . Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 . Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 . Seminar . Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 . Field Work . Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50 654/1368 4.50 4.73 4.30 . Were special techniques successful 24 5 0 1 0 1 7 4.56 ****/ 948 **** 4.17 3.95 . Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 . Seminar . Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 . Field Work . Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 . Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 Seminar . Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Field Work . Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 Seminar . Were criteria for grading made clear 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Field Work . Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Seminar Nere criteria for grading made clear Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 29 0 1 4 2 1 1 2.67 ****/ 555 **** 2.04 4.29 10 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 7 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 32 1 0 1 1 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Field Work Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 3.40 ****/ 288 **** 3.31 3.68 Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 3 Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Self Paced Were there enough proctors for all the students 29 2 3 1 0 3 0 2.43 ****/ 312 **** 3.01 3.68 3 Self Paced 37 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
Self Paced . Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99
37 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 110 **** 4.00 3.99 6
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Ma
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 38 Non-ma
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not $^{\circ}$ P 0 responses to be significant
I 0 Other 13
I U UTDET IS

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101 University of Maryland Page 1536 Title ADVOCATES PROGRAM FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

								T t-		G	D t-	TIMB C	T 7	G
Ouestions	NR	NT7\	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	3 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	965/1649	4.53	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.23	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	497/1595	4.63	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.58	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	883/1512	4.40	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	4.90	4.67	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.37	4.06	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	4	5.00	1/1568	4.90	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1572	4.90	4.74	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/15/2	4.90	4.67	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.50	695/1559	4.55	4.64	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	690/1352	4.30	4.24	3.98	3.97	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	_	U	_	2	4.00	090/1332	4.30	4.24	3.90	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	795/1384	4.30	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	948/1368	4.30	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	699/ 948	4.05	4.17	3.95	4.00	3.50
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	544/ 555	1 25	2 04	4 29	4 22	1 50
J. More requirements for tab reports creatly specified	4	U	_	_	U	U	U	1.50	311/ 333	1.20	2.04	1.43	1.44	1.50
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	4.05	4.00

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0102 University of Maryland ADVOCATES PROGRAM

Baltimore County

Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO 6 Enrollment:

Title

Fall 2008

Page 1537

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire															
			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	274/1649	4.53	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1313/1648	4.23	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	950/1375	4.50	4.63	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	Ο	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.63	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.75	

4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	U	Ü	Τ	3	4.75	236/1595	4.63	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.75
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1533	4.58	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.50
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.40	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.80
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	169/1623	4.90	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.80
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00

8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.37	4.06	4.02	4.33

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

	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	376/1384	4.30	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.60
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	4.80	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.60
_	D1111 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-	_	_	_	-	_		1 60	EEO /1260	4 20	4 60	4 20	4 20	1 60

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.30	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	170/ 948	4.05	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.60

Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	0	0	0 1	.00	553/ 555	1.25	2.04	4.29	4.22	1.00

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

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

	Self Paced													
5. Were the	ere enough proctors for all the stud	dents 5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	4.05	****

٠.	 011010	0110 4511	PICCCCID	 u	0110	Doddonos		•	•	_	Ü	•	Ŭ	•	 ,	 1.00	1.0
							_										
							Freque	ncy	Dıst:	rıbu	tıon	l					

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

ADDICTIVE BEHAV PATTER

Title Instructor: DVORAK, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 36 Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1538 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Ceneral																
1. Did vou	gain new			is course	12	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.83
		or make clear			11	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	161/1648	4.88	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.88
		stions reflect	_	-	11	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.63	4.27	4.22	4.80
		cions reflect			11	1	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	119/1595	4.92	4.61	4.20	4.21	4.92
5. Did ass	igned read	dings contribu	ite to what	you learned	12	0	0	1	1	2	20	4.71	210/1533	4.71	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.71
6. Did wri	tten assig	gnments contri	bute to wh	at you learned	12	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.83
7. Was the	grading s	system clearly	explained		11	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	97/1623	4.92	4.67	4.16	4.08	4.92
8. How man	y times wa	as class cance	elled		11	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ld you gra	ade the overal	l teaching	effectiveness	16	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	146/1621	4.79	4.37	4.06	4.02	4.79
		Lecture																
		tor's lectures			14	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	301/1568		4.74	4.43	4.39	4.86
		or seem intere			14 14	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572		4.88	4.70	4.64	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	206/1564	4.86	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.86
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1		4.95	103/1559	4.95	4.64	4.29	4.23	4.95
5. Did aud	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:					0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	172/1352	4.73	4.24	3.98	3.97	4.73
	Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
				-	19	0	0	0	1	2	14		238/1384		4.58	4.08	4.11	4.76
		s actively end			19	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94			4.76	4.29	4.37	4.94
		_	_	en discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.73	4.30	4.39	4.94
4. Were sp	ecial teci	nniques succes	SSIUL		19	4	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.00
		Laborat	-															
5. Were re	quirements	s for lab repo	orts clearl	y specified	34	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar																
5. Were cr	iteria foi	r grading made	e clear		35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.58	****
		Field W																
		ence contribut			35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	3.59	****
		understand you			35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 39	****	4.75	4.09	4.21	****
		or available f			35 35	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39 ****/ 39	****	4.44	4.47	4.43	****
		ould you discu nelp you carry			32	1	2	0	0	0			****/ 312		4.55 3.01	4.38	4.32	***
5. Dia con	rerences i	merp you carry	out lielu	activities	34	1	2	U	U	U	1	2.33	/ 312		3.01	3.00	3.00	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r •	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	L				6	Under-g	rad 3	6	Non-	major	32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - : respons				_	ıh
				I O		Otł	ner					7	respoils	ca co L	e sign	ıııcall	L	
				? 0		OCI	1CT					,						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0101 University of Maryland

Title Instructor

Enrollment Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	SOCIAL WORK METHODS I	Baltimore	County	FEB 11, 2009
or:	KNIGHT, CAROLYN	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3029
nt:	11			

Page 1539

		Questions	\$		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.57	4.28	4.27	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	216/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	4.80
		uestions reflect			0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375		4.63	4.27	4.22	4.80
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	383/1595		4.61	4.20	4.21	4.60
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	327/1533		4.34	4.04	4.05	4.56
				to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1512	4.78	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.78
		g system clearly			1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	448/1623		4.67	4.16	4.08	4.56
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	3	6		1037/1646			4.69		4.67
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621			4.06	4.02	4.71
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	l and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.67	4.28	4.25	4.80
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.64	4.29	4.23	4.80
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1352	****	4.24	3.98	3.97	***
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.58	4.08	4.11	4.88
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.76	4.29	4.37	4.88
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful		3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.17	3.95	4.00	4.50
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	clear	î	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.58	****
	-	Field W			•											2 50		
5. Dia co	nierences	s neip you carry	out i	field activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.60	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
00-27	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	8		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ah
	-	- · · · · · · · · · · ·		P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.	her					7			5-			
							-											

? 0

Course-Section: SOWK 470 0101 University of Maryland

SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH Baltimore County

Title SOCIAL WORK RE Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1540 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		
														. – – –
General	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	106/1640	4 57	4 57	4 00	4 50	4 0
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	,		4.57	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	216/1648		4.58	4.23	4.36	4.8
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375		4.63	4.27	4.48	4.9
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1		4.88	150/1595		4.61	4.20	4.36	4.8
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	1		3.90	915/1533		4.34	4.04	4.14	
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7		, -		4.50	4.10	4.26	4.6
. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	,		4.67	4.16	4.27	
. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10		1/1646			4.69	4.71	
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1621	4.59	4.37	4.06	4.24	4.6
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	588/1568	4.76	4.74	4.43	4.54	4.
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.95	4.88	4.70	4.79	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	434/1564	4.70	4.67	4.28	4.40	4.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.69	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	836/1352	4.16	4.24	3.98	4.07	3.
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	160/1384	4.58	4.58	4.08	4.35	4.
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.89			4.76	4.29	4.56	4.
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	. ,		4.73	4.30	4.58	
. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	-	4.43	,				4.31	
Labovatawy														
Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	2.04	4.29	4.41	3.
Seminar . Were criteria for grading made clear	7	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.31	3.68	3.71	**
. Hore officeria for grading made officer	•	_	_	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	2.50	, 200		3.31	3.00	3.71	
Field Work														
. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.95	* *
Self Paced														
. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.22	**
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		 Pa	auir		or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		 1

					rrequein	cy Distribution					
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 470 8620 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: TING, LAURA

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

Page 1541 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	965/1649	4.57	4.57	4.28	4.50	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1076/1648		4.58	4.23	4.36	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	922/1375	4.49	4.63	4.27	4.48	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1021/1595	4.48	4.61	4.20	4.36	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	761/1533	3.99	4.34	4.04	4.14	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	764/1512	4.39	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	502/1623	4.70	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646		4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.59	4.37	4.06	4.24	4.5
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.76	4.74	4.43	4.54	4.8
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	4.95	4.88	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	7		434/1564	4.70	4.67	4.28	4.40	4.7
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	607/1559	4.69	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.5
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	351/1352	4.16	4.24	3.98	4.07	4.4
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	661/1384	4.58	4.58	4.08	4.35	4.2
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	875/1382	4.54	4.76	4.29	4.56	4.1
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	922/1368	4.49	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.0
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	688/ 948	3.99	4.17	3.95	4.31	3.5
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.86	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.01	3.68	3.95	***
Freq	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00.27 0 0.00.00 0 7 0									Cmaduat		0			

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-	_	,	
				?	0						

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1542 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies					Inst	Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	230/1649	4.51	4.57	4.28	4.50	4.86
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	182/1648		4.58	4.23	4.36	4.86
					0	11	0	0	0	0	3		****/1375		4.63	4.27	4.48	****
	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals . Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	4	10	4.71			4.61	4.20	4.36	4.71
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned								1	4	8	4.54	342/1533	4.26	4.34	4.04	4.14	4.54
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1512	4.46	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.77
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	97/1623	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.92
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1621	4.38	4.37	4.06	4.24	4.88
		Lectur																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	2		4.86	316/1568		4.74	4.43	4.54	4.86
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572		4.88	4.70	4.79	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.71			4.67	4.28		4.71
		es contribute t		-	0 1	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	. ,		4.64	4.29		4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						9	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	914/1352	3.69	4.24	3.98	4.07	3.75
		Discus			0	0	0											
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	1	1	12	4.79	219/1384		4.58	4.08	4.35	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93			4.76	4.29	4.56	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92			4.73	4.30		4.92
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	sstul		1	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	82/ 948	4.36	4.17	3.95	4.31	4.92
E Moro r	o and romo	Labora	_	early specified	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 555	****	2 04	4 20	1 11	****
5. Wele I	equireme	nts for lab rep	OILS CI	early specified	13	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 555		2.04	4.29	4.41	
E Moro a	mitomio	Semina			10	1	0	0	0	3	0	4 00	****/ 288	3.33	2 21	2 60	2 71	****
5. Wele C	illeria	for grading mad	e Clear		10	1	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	""""/ 200	3.33	3.31	3.00	3.71	
		Field																
	_			hat you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52		4.50	4.06	4.86	5.00
_				uation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 48		4.75	4.09	4.42	5.00
		ctor available			10	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 39		4.44	4.47	4.52	5.00
		could you disc			10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39		4.55	4.38	4.59	5.00
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	21/ 312	3.81	3.01	3.68	3.95	4.67
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A б		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	`s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough					ſh

Other

10

P 0

I 0

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20

0

3.50-4.00

Grad.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1543 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1 5'1		General		•	0	•	•	0	-	1.0	4 05	110/1640	4 = 1	4 55	4 00	4 50	4 05	
		ew insights, skills fr		0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	112/1649		4.57	4.28	4.50	4.95	
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	1	19	4.95	89/1648	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.36	4.95	
				0	12 0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.48	5.00	
	1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							0	2	18	4.90	133/1595		4.61	4.20		4.90	
				0	1	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	264/1533		4.34	4.04	4.14	4.63	
		signments contribute		0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	110/1512	4.46	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.90	
		g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70		4.62	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.70	
	-	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	833/1646		4.83		4.71		
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	261/1621	4.38	4.37	4.06	4.24	4.63	
		Lecture																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	316/1568	4.73	4.74	4.43	4.54	4.85	
2. Did th	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	4.89	4.88	4.70	4.79	5.00				
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	101/1564	4.67	4.67	4.28	4.40	4.95	
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	205/1559	4.62	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.90	
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	1	12	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	942/1352	3.69	4.24	3.98	4.07	3.73	
		Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	3	16	4.84	180/1384	4.54	4.58	4.08	4.35	4.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	2	17	4.89	252/1382	4.78	4.76	4.29	4.56	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	1	18	4.95	158/1368		4.73			4.95	
		echniques successful		1 1	1	1	1	1	1	14	4.44	249/ 948		4.17		4.31	4.4	
		Laboratory																
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab reports of	clearly specified	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.41	****	
		Seminar																
5. Were c	criteria	for grading made clea	ır	14	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.31	3.68	3.71	3.33	
1 Did fi	iold ormo	Field Work	what was laawnad	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.50	4.06	4.86	***	
		rience contribute to y understand your eva		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 52	4.75	4.75	4.09	4.42	***	
_		-				0											***	
		ctor available for co		19	0		0	0	0	1	5.00	,	4.44	4.44	4.47	4.52	***	
	_	could you discuss yo		19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	4.55	4.55	4.38	4.59		
5. Dia co	onierence	s help you carry out	field activities	14	0	1	0	U	4	1	3.67	207/ 312	3.81	3.01	3.68	3.95	3.67	
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	 A 15		 Ra	anir		or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		10	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3						4u11	cu I	OT MG	בטנ ג	. 0	U	Graduat	_	J	ria JC	jor 19		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	20	Non-	ma ior	1	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		GE.	пста	_				U	onder-9	Luu 2		Non-major			
04-150	/	3.00-3.49 3	ט ע															

Electives

Other

0

19

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

0

Ρ

Ι

SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Title SOCIAL WORK Instructor: TING, LAURA

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1544 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	1183/1649	4.51	4.57	4.28	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	441/1648	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.36	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	342/1595	4.64	4.61	4.20	4.36	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	718/1533	4.26	4.34	4.04	4.14	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	436/1512	4.46	4.50	4.10	4.26	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	469/1623	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	632/1621	4.38	4.37	4.06	4.24	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	636/1568	4.73	4.74	4.43	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	840/1572	4.89	4.88	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	620/1564	4.67		4.28	4.40	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	6		1088/1559	4.62	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	2	4	-	3.62	996/1352		4.24		4.07	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	J	_		2	2	-	-	3.02	JJ0/1332	3.05	1.21	3.90	1.07	3.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	771/1384	4.54	4.58	4.08	4.35	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	455/1382	4.78	4.76	4.29	4.56	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	327/1368		4.73	4.30	4.58	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	411/ 948		4.17	3.95	4.31	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	4.61	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 555	****	2.04	4.29	4.41	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	3.33	3.31	3.68	3.71	****
-1 11 1														
Field Work	_	0	-	-	•	_	_	4 00	24/ 50	4 50	4 50	1 06	4 06	4 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	34/ 52	4.50	4.50	4.06	4.86	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	16/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.09	4.42	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	35/ 39	4.44	4.44	4.47		3.88
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	26/ 39	4.55	4.55	4.38	4.59	4.10
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	3	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	255/ 312	3.81	3.01	3.68	3.95	3.11
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.22	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA		Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	jors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	12	-	-	_		

? 0

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: OK

OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1545 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1007/1649	4.51	4.57	4.28	4.50	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	770/1648	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.36	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	5.00	4.63	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	759/1595	4.64	4.61	4.20	4.36	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1103/1533	4.26	4.34	4.04	4.14	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	1143/1512	4.46	4.50	4.10	4.26	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	757/1623	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	3	4			1217/1621		4.37		4.24	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	803/1568	4.73	4.74	4.43	4.54	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	912/1572	4.89	4.88	4.70	4.79	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2		4.50	651/1564	4.67	4.67		4.40	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	-	4.58	607/1559	4.62	4.64	4.29	4.41	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	0	0			****/1352		4.24		4.07	****	
J. Did dadiovibadi eccimiques cimanee your anderseanding	Ü		Ü	0	Ü	0		3.00	71332	3.05	1.21	3.70	1.07		
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	478/1384	4.54	4.58	4.08	4.35	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1		4.62	530/1382	4.78	4.76	4.29	4.56	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4		4.67	522/1368	4.85	4.73	4.30	4.58	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.36	4.17			4.00	
4. Were special techniques successium	5	0	U	1	U	4	4	4.00	431/ 940	4.30	4.1/	3.93	4.31	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	1	0	0	1	2 67	****/ 555	****	2.04	1 20	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	13	U	1	1	U	U		2.07	/ 555		2.04	4.43	4.41		
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
		0	0	0	1		0		****/ 92	****	****			****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17 11	3	2	0	1	0 1	0		****/ 288			4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	3	2	U	1	Т	U	2.25	****/ 288	3.33	3.31	3.08	3.71		
Field Work															
	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	++++/ [7	4 50	4 50	1 00	1 00	****	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	•	-	•	0	2		****/ 52	4.50	4.50	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.09	4.42		
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	4.44	4.44	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39		4.55	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	3.81	3.01	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced		_			_										
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	***	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	4.22	****	

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1545 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						