```
                                                    Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  6   0   0   0   3   4  16  4.57  528/1509  4.57  4.47  4.31  4.34  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   6   0   0   0   2   4  17  4.65  367/1509  4.65  4.61  4.26  4.32  4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  6   0   1   1   1   2  18  4.52  500/1287  4.52  4.60  4.30  4.35  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   6   0   0   1   3   1  18  4.57  389/1459  4.57  4.54  4.22  4.30  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   5  17  4.70  200/1406  4.70  4.36  4.09  4.09  4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0  0   0   2   1  20  4.78  123/1384  4.78  4.45  4.11  4.09  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           6   0   0   1   2   2  18  4.61  341/1489  4.61  4.63  4.17  4.19  4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                 6   0   0   0   0   9  14  4.61  990/1506  4.61  4.90  4.67  4.61  4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2 0  1   0   6  10  4.47  367/1463  4.47  4.24  4.09  4.08  4.47

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       7   0   0   0   1   4  17  4.73  497/1438  4.73  4.64  4.46  4.48  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  7   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  138/1411  4.90  4.60  4.31  4.37  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    7   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86  217/1405  4.86  4.62  4.32  4.39  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 10 1  0   1   2   8  4.33  421/1236  4.33  4.24  4.00  4.11  4.33

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0  0   0   1   1   7  4.67  308/1260  4.67  4.55  4.14  4.19  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0  0   0   0   1   8  4.89  221/1255  4.89  4.76  4.33  4.37  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0  0   1   0   8  4.78  398/1258  4.78  4.77  4.38  4.44  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                19   5   0   0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/ 873  **** 4.15  4.03  4.04  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99    1      A   19      Required for Majors   4     Graduate      0      Major        3
 28-55     3      1.00-1.99    0      B    0
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General               5     Under-grad   29      Non-major   26
 84-150    2      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives             9     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 0
                                      ?    0
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	0	6	2	6	4.00	1114/1509	4.45	4.47	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	753/1509	4.71	4.61	4.26	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	4	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	426/1287	4.64	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	667/1459	4.56	4.54	4.22	4.30	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	281/1406	4.59	4.36	4.09	4.09	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	385/1384	4.53	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	513/1489	4.63	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.98	4.90	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	804/1463	4.23	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	514/1438	4.84	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1107/1421	4.76	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	532/1411	4.71	4.60	4.31	4.37	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	808/1405	4.63	4.62	4.32	4.39	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	229/1236	4.64	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	396/1260	4.62	4.55	4.14	4.19	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	494/1255	4.74	4.76	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	542/1258	4.74	4.77	4.38	4.44	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	322/ 873	4.43	4.15	4.03	4.04	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  2                University of Maryland                                    Page 1392
Title        Info Tech In Social Wo        Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Lopez,Christina               Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      26
Questionnaires:  26                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   5   0   0   0   4   3  14  4.48  635/1509  4.45  4.47 4.31 4.34  4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0   0   0   1   2  18  4.81  201/1509  4.71  4.61 4.26 4.32  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   5   0   0   1   4  11  4.63  403/1287  4.64  4.60 4.30 4.35  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5   0   0   0   2   4  15  4.62  335/1459  4.56  4.54 4.22 4.30  4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   1   4   2  13  4.35  486/1406  4.59  4.36 4.09 4.09  4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0  1   0   2   5  12  4.35  505/1384  4.53  4.45 4.11 4.09  4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            6   0   0   0   3   2  15  4.60  341/1489  4.63  4.63 4.17 4.19  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  6   0   0   0   0   0  20  5.00    1/1506  4.98  4.90 4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0   0   5  10   1  3.75 1101/1463  4.23  4.24 4.09 4.08  3.75


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  291/1438  4.84  4.64 4.46 4.48  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0   0   0   0   5  15  4.75  881/1421  4.76  4.81 4.73 4.76  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   0   0   3   2  15  4.60  496/1411  4.71  4.60 4.31 4.37  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0   0   0   3   2  14  4.58  568/1405  4.63  4.62 4.32 4.39  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0  1   0   3   1  15  4.45  322/1236  4.64  4.24 4.00 4.11  4.45


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   5   1  14  4.45  469/1260  4.62  4.55 4.14 4.19  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   2   3  15  4.65  453/1255  4.74  4.76 4.33 4.37  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0   0   2   3  15  4.65  514/1258  4.74  4.77 4.38 4.44  4.65
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2   0   0   2   3  13  4.61  173/ 873  4.43  4.15 4.03 4.04  4.61


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 184  ****  **** 4.16 4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 198  ****  **** 4.22 4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23 0 0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 184  ****  **** 4.48 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           23   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 177  ****  **** 4.36 4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 23   1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 165  ****  **** 4.18 4.56  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22  1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  89  ****  **** 4.49 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  92  ****  **** 4.54 **** ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  90  ****  **** 4.50 **** ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  92  ****  **** 4.38 4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  93  ****  **** 4.06 2.88  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22   0   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 ****/  48  ****  **** 4.39 4.79  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22   0   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 ****/  48  ****  **** 4.41 4.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       22   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  47  ****  **** 4.51 4.83  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   22   1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  47  ****  **** 4.18 4.56  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22   1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  44  ****  **** 4.32 4.67  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22  0   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 ****/  49  ****  **** 4.26 4.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    22   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  41  ****  **** 4.14 **** ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      23   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  46  ****  **** 4.31 4.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       22   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  37  ****  **** 4.05 **** ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     23   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  30  ****  **** 4.27 **** ****
```

Title   Info Tech In Social Wo   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Lopez,Christina   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   11   Required for Majors 14   Graduate   0   Major   16
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   5
 56-83   5   2.00-2.99   2   C   2   General   1   Under-grad   26   Non-major   10
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   1   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   0
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  3                   University of Maryland                              Page 1393
Title        Info Tech In Social Wo           Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Morris,Katherin                  Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires:  24                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  184/1509  4.45  4.47  4.31 4.34  4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96   58/1509  4.71  4.61  4.26 4.32  4.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  13  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  326/1287  4.64  4.60  4.30 4.35  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  5 18  4.71  237/1459  4.56  4.54  4.22 4.30  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  4 19  4.83  126/1406  4.59  4.36  4.09 4.09  4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  3 19  4.78  123/1384  4.53  4.45  4.11 4.09  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  4 19  4.83  139/1489  4.63  4.63  4.17 4.19  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  1 21  4.95  292/1506  4.98  4.90  4.67 4.61  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  0  3 16  4.84  103/1463  4.23  4.24  4.09 4.08  4.84


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  1 22  4.96  110/1438  4.84  4.64  4.46 4.48  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  269/1421  4.76  4.81  4.73 4.76  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96   69/1411  4.71  4.60  4.31 4.37  4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96   86/1405  4.63  4.62  4.32 4.39  4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  0  0  0  2 19  4.90   67/1236  4.64  4.24  4.00 4.11  4.90


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  157/1260  4.62  4.55  4.14 4.19  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  103/1255  4.74  4.76  4.33 4.37  4.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  118/1258  4.74  4.77  4.38 4.44  4.96
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   1  1  0  1  8 13  4.39  265/ 873  4.43  4.15  4.03 4.04  4.39


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 184  **** ****  4.16 4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 23 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  **** ****  4.22 4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 184  **** ****  4.48 4.62  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  89  **** ****  4.49 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  **** ****  4.54 ****  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  90  **** ****  4.50 ****  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  **** ****  4.38 4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  **** ****  4.06 2.88  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  **** ****  4.26 4.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.14 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  **** ****  4.31 4.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  **** ****  4.05 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      23  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  **** ****  4.27 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0         A   10          Required for Majors  18    Graduate      0     Major      21
28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0         B    8                                                         Non-major   3
56-83     2      2.00-2.99    0         C    1          General               0    Under-grad   24
84-150    2      3.00-3.49    1         D    0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    5         F    0          Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0          Other                 0
```

?   0

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  1                University of Maryland                              Page 1394
Title       Intro Social Work I            Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Sanders Baffour              Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     41
Questionnaires: 40                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4  0  2  0  6 13 15  4.08 1058/1509  4.54  4.47  4.31 4.34  4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4  0  2  0  8  9 17  4.08 1027/1509  4.51  4.61  4.26 4.32  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  0  0  0  4 10 22  4.50  519/1287  4.69  4.60  4.30 4.35  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4  4  2  3  6 10 11  3.78 1177/1459  4.25  4.54  4.22 4.30  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  2  4 14 14  4.09  753/1406  4.38  4.36  4.09 4.09  4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 3 2 5 14 11 3.80 1017/1384 4.43 4.45 4.11 4.09 3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5  0  2  1  3 12 17  4.17  844/1489  4.54  4.63  4.17 4.19  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4  0  0  0  0  1 35  4.97  175/1506  4.96  4.90  4.67 4.61  4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 4 0 11 13 5 3.45 1268/1463 4.15 4.24 4.09 4.08 3.45


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  2  1  4  9 20  4.22 1094/1438  4.69  4.64  4.46 4.48  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4  0  1  2  1  5 27  4.53 1146/1421  4.78  4.81  4.73 4.76  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 2 0 8 11 14 4.00 1051/1411 4.54 4.60 4.31 4.37 4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5  0  1  2  6 13 13  4.00 1047/1405  4.55  4.62  4.32 4.39  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 2 1 2 4 8 16 4.16 563/1236 4.49 4.24 4.00 4.11 4.16


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 3 2 5 12 9 3.71 964/1260 4.43 4.55 4.14 4.19 3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 1 2 3 8 17 4.23 803/1255 4.57 4.76 4.33 4.37 4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 2 0 1 11 17 4.32 777/1258 4.71 4.77 4.38 4.44 4.32
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  1  3  1  8 10  8  3.63  660/ 873  4.21  4.15  4.03 4.04  3.63


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  34  4  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16 4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.51 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 36 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.62 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           36  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36 4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  36 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.56 ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33 3 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 5.00 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 34 2 0 0 1 3 0 3.75 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 **** ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 34 2 0 2 0 1 1 3.25 ****/ 90 **** **** 4.50 **** ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    34  2  0  0  1  3  0  3.75 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                34  2  1  1  0  1  1  3.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 2.88  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.79 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.50 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   39  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18 4.56  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.26 4.33 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    38  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 **** ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      38  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 4.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     39  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 **** ****
```

                                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  2                        University of Maryland                                    Page 1395
Title          Intro Social Work I                 Baltimore County                                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Acquavita,Shaun                     Fall   2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 28                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                     Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5   Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   1   3  23  4.81  235/1509  4.54  4.47  4.31  4.34  4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   1   4  22  4.78  234/1509  4.51  4.61  4.26  4.32  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   4  22  4.78  240/1287  4.69  4.60  4.30  4.35  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   1   1   5  20  4.63  324/1459  4.25  4.54  4.22  4.30  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   1   3   5  17  4.46  377/1406  4.38  4.36  4.09  4.09  4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0   0   2   4  20  4.69  199/1384  4.43  4.45  4.11  4.09  4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   1   2  23  4.85  127/1489  4.54  4.63  4.17  4.19  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0   1  25  4.96  233/1506  4.96  4.90  4.67  4.61  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0   0   1   9   8  4.39  489/1463  4.15  4.24  4.09  4.08  4.39


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   0   0   0   1  23  4.96  110/1438  4.69  4.64  4.46  4.48  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   0   1   3  21  4.80  794/1421  4.78  4.81  4.73  4.76  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   0   0   1   3  20  4.79  255/1411  4.54  4.60  4.31  4.37  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   0   0   4  21  4.84  239/1405  4.55  4.62  4.32  4.39  4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  0   1   1   1  22  4.76  121/1236  4.49  4.24  4.00  4.11  4.76


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   0   1   1  25  4.89  150/1260  4.43  4.55  4.14  4.19  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   0   0   2   3  22  4.74  356/1255  4.57  4.76  4.33  4.37  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0   0   0   4  23  4.85  299/1258  4.71  4.77  4.38  4.44  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   1   0   0   1   4  21  4.77  109/ 873  4.21  4.15  4.03  4.04  4.77


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  27   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.51  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2         0.00-0.99    0       A   17          Required for Majors  23    Graduate      0       Major       18
 28-55     1         1.00-1.99    1       B    5
 56-83     5         2.00-2.99    1       C    2          General               0    Under-grad   28       Non-major   10
 84-150    0         3.00-3.49    1       D    0
 Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    4       F    0          Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  3                 University of Maryland                              Page 1396
Title        Intro Social Work I            Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Eisenberg,David                Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      40
Questionnaires:  39                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	5	31	4.71	351/1509	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	28	4.66	367/1509	4.51	4.61	4.26	4.32	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	229/1287	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	3	11	19	4.34	676/1459	4.25	4.54	4.22	4.30	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	27	4.61	269/1406	4.38	4.36	4.09	4.09	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	32	4.79	123/1384	4.43	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	8	28	4.61	341/1489	4.54	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	350/1506	4.96	4.90	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	0	9	21	4.61	241/1463	4.15	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	35	4.89	233/1438	4.69	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1421	4.78	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	34	4.84	201/1411	4.54	4.60	4.31	4.37	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	32	4.81	273/1405	4.55	4.62	4.32	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	5	26	4.56	242/1236	4.49	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	29	4.70	280/1260	4.43	4.55	4.14	4.19	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	367/1255	4.57	4.76	4.33	4.37	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	37	4.95	142/1258	4.71	4.77	4.38	4.44	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	2	1	1	7	15	4.23	344/ 873	4.21	4.15	4.03	4.04	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16			Under-grad	39		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

```
P    0                                                    responses to be significant
I    0              Other              0
?    1
```

Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  10   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   244/1509  4.80 4.47 4.31 4.32  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94    81/1509  4.94 4.61 4.26 4.25  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87   159/1287  4.87 4.60 4.30 4.33  4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   10   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   146/1459  4.80 4.54 4.22 4.26  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   0   4  11  4.73   175/1406  4.73 4.36 4.09 4.12  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   0   3  12  4.80   107/1384  4.80 4.45 4.11 4.15  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           12   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00     1/1489  5.00 4.63 4.17 4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 10   0   0   0   0   1  14  4.93   408/1506  4.93 4.90 4.67 4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 1  0   1   0   2   9  4.58   263/1463  4.58 4.24 4.09 4.08  4.58


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00     1/1438  5.00 4.64 4.46 4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00     1/1421  5.00 4.81 4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00     1/1411  5.00 4.60 4.31 4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    11   0   0   0   0   1  13  4.93   137/1405  4.93 4.62 4.32 4.32  4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 1  0   0   0   0  14  5.00     1/1236  5.00 4.24 4.00 4.07  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   2  12  4.86   172/1260  4.86 4.55 4.14 4.22  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00     1/1255  5.00 4.76 4.33 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0   0   0   1  13  4.93   189/1258  4.93 4.77 4.38 4.42  4.93
4. Were special techniques successful                 11   4   0   0   1   3   6  4.50   209/ 873  4.50 4.15 4.03 4.08  4.50
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0          0.00-0.99   0     A   4          Required for Majors  8     Graduate     0       Major        7
28-55      0          1.00-1.99   0     B   5                                                          
56-83      4          2.00-2.99   2     C   1          General              0     Under-grad  25       Non-major   18
84-150     0          3.00-3.49   1     D   0                                                          
Grad.      0          3.50-4.00   1     F   0          Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other                1
                                        ?   1
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  0  0  1  20  4.77  279/1509  4.77  4.47  4.31  4.32  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  22  5.00    1/1509  5.00  4.61  4.26  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  1  21  4.95   64/1287  4.95  4.60  4.30  4.33  4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  21  4.95   48/1459  4.95  4.54  4.22  4.26  4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  5  16  4.76  158/1406  4.76  4.36  4.09  4.12  4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 19  4.90   71/1384  4.90  4.45  4.11  4.15  4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  0  0  21  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.63  4.17  4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  0  21  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 3 16  4.84  103/1463  4.84  4.24  4.09  4.08  4.84


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  1  20  4.95  110/1438  4.95  4.64  4.46  4.43  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0  21  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  0  1  20  4.95   69/1411  4.95  4.60  4.31  4.29  4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  1  20  4.95   86/1405  4.95  4.62  4.32  4.32  4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 1 3 16  4.57  229/1236  4.57  4.24  4.00  4.07  4.57


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 3 17  4.85  172/1260  4.85  4.55  4.14  4.22  4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 1 19  4.95  123/1255  4.95  4.76  4.33  4.37  4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 0 20  5.00    1/1258  5.00  4.77  4.38  4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   5  0  0  3  0  12  4.60  178/ 873  4.60  4.15  4.03  4.08  4.60
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2        0.00-0.99   0        A   18      Required for Majors  13     Graduate    0       Major       13
28-55     0        1.00-1.99   1        B    2
56-83     6        2.00-2.99   3        C    0      General               0     Under-grad  22      Non-major    9
84-150    2        3.00-3.49   3        D    0
Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   4        F    0      Electives             6     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  1                University of Maryland                          Page 1399
Title        Human Behavior                 Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Okundaye,Joshua                Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 38                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    4   0  0  0  1 12 21  4.59  505/1509  4.17  4.47  4.31 4.32  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  4  7 24  4.57  459/1509  4.05  4.61  4.26 4.25  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  3 10 22  4.54  481/1287  4.12  4.60  4.30 4.33  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0  0  1  4  7 23  4.49  487/1459  4.13  4.54  4.22 4.26  4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  3 15 17  4.40  446/1406  4.15  4.36  4.09 4.12  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0  0  3  1 10 20  4.38  466/1384  4.09  4.45  4.11 4.15  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  3 12 20  4.49  485/1489  4.22  4.63  4.17 4.14  4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  9 26  4.74  858/1506  4.91  4.90  4.67 4.67  4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0  0  1 12 14  4.48  353/1463  3.82  4.24  4.09 4.08  4.48


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  1  0  1 11 21  4.50  800/1438  4.00  4.64  4.46 4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  0  3 30  4.91  537/1421  4.45  4.81  4.73 4.73  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  1  1  1  8 23  4.50  617/1411  3.91  4.60  4.31 4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  1  0  1  6 26  4.65  486/1405  4.07  4.62  4.32 4.32  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 16  3  1  4  3  6  3.47  998/1236  3.61  4.24  4.00 4.07  3.47


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  1  0  4  5 22  4.47  451/1260  4.08  4.55  4.14 4.22  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  1  6 25  4.75  344/1255  4.45  4.76  4.33 4.37  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  2  3 26  4.77  398/1258  4.59  4.77  4.38 4.42  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   3  1  0  8  5 14  4.11  417/ 873  3.98  4.15  4.03 4.08  4.11


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  29   6  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16 4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22 4.17  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48 4.52  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           34   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36 4.30  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 34   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18 4.11  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31  2  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49 4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 2  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33  1  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50 4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    32   1  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                33   1  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 3.94  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39 4.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 36   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.34  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       36   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51 4.62  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   36   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18 4.47  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 36   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32 4.40  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    34   0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      34   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       35   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     35   1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	30
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  2                  University of Maryland                        Page 1400
Title       Human Behavior                    Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Wiechelt,Shelly                  Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      35
Questionnaires:  35                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   6   0  4  1  6   7  11  3.69 1330/1509  4.17  4.47  4.31  4.32  3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7   0  2  1  8   7  10  3.79 1240/1509  4.05  4.61  4.26  4.25  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7   0  2  1  7  10   8  3.75 1091/1287  4.12  4.60  4.30  4.33  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6   0  0  0 10   8  11  4.03  958/1459  4.13  4.54  4.22  4.26  4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7  0  2  2  6   9   9  3.75 1045/1406  4.15  4.36  4.09  4.12  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 4  0  4   9  11  3.82 1001/1384  4.09  4.45  4.11  4.15  3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            6   0  0  0  5  12  12  4.24  770/1489  4.22  4.63  4.17  4.14  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7   0  0  0  0   0  28  5.00    1/1506  4.91  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0 0 3 5  10   1  3.47 1257/1463  3.82  4.24  4.09  4.08  3.47


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0  4  1  6   6  11  3.68 1341/1438  4.00  4.64  4.46  4.43  3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0  0  3  3   6  16  4.25 1292/1421  4.45  4.81  4.73  4.73  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  2  4  8   6   8  3.50 1277/1411  3.91  4.60  4.31  4.29  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0  2  4  4  10   8  3.64 1227/1405  4.07  4.62  4.32  4.32  3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 1 2  2  9   5  10  3.68  898/1236  3.61  4.24  4.00  4.07  3.68


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  5  2  4   8   9  3.50 1045/1260  4.08  4.55  4.14  4.22  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  4  2   4  18  4.29  762/1255  4.45  4.76  4.33  4.37  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1  1  1   5  20  4.50  620/1258  4.59  4.77  4.38  4.42  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   5  1  2  5   7   8  3.83  575/ 873  3.98  4.15  4.03  4.08  3.83


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  33  0  0  0  1   1   0  3.50 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 0 0 2  0   0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.17  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 1 0 0 1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           33  1  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36  4.30  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33  1  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18  4.11  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33 0  0  0  2   0   0  3.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49  4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 1 0 0 1   0   0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33 1  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50  4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    33  0  0  0  1   1   0  3.50 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38  4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                33  0  0  1  0   1   0  3.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  3.94  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33  0  0  0  1   1   0  3.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33  0  1  0  1   0   0  2.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.34  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       33  1  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.62  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   33  1  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 33  1  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.40  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    34  0  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      34  0  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       34  0  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     34  0  0  0  1   0   0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  5.00  ****
```

                                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   2   0.00-0.99   0   A   10   Required for Majors 24   Graduate   0   Major   28
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   11
56-83   1   2.00-2.99   2   C   0   General   0   Under-grad 35   Non-major   7
84-150   4   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   0
                                        ?   1

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  3                    University of Maryland                              Page 1401
Title          Human Behavior                   Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Singleton,Hanna                  Fall  2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 34                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  4 15 14  4.24  901/1509  4.17  4.47  4.31 4.32  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  2 14  7 11  3.79 1234/1509  4.05  4.61  4.26 4.25  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  1  5 15 12  4.06  903/1287  4.12  4.60  4.30 4.33  4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  1  3  6 12 11  3.88 1111/1459  4.13  4.54  4.22 4.26  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  4 12 16  4.30  527/1406  4.15  4.36  4.09 4.12  4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 2  0  8  7 16  4.06  773/1384  4.09  4.45  4.11 4.15  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  1  4  6  7 15  3.94 1070/1489  4.22  4.63  4.17 4.14  3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  0  0  0  0  0 32  5.00    1/1506  4.91  4.90  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 2 0 1 14  9  3  3.52 1237/1463  3.82  4.24  4.09 4.08  3.52


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  1  3  4 18  7  3.82 1294/1438  4.00  4.64  4.46 4.43  3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  1  5 14 13  4.18 1314/1421  4.45  4.81  4.73 4.73  4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0  3  9 14  6  3.72 1218/1411  3.91  4.60  4.31 4.29  3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  1  2  6 14 10  3.91 1132/1405  4.07  4.62  4.32 4.32  3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 1  3  7 10  7  3.68  898/1236  3.61  4.24  4.00 4.07  3.68


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  1  4 13 15  4.27  605/1260  4.08  4.55  4.14 4.22  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1  0  6  7 19  4.30  749/1255  4.45  4.76  4.33 4.37  4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  2  3  4 23  4.50  620/1258  4.59  4.77  4.38 4.42  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  2  1  1  5 14 10  4.00  442/ 873  3.98  4.15  4.03 4.08  4.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49 4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 33 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50 4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   33  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38 4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               33  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06 3.94  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   32  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     32  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      32  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    33  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 5.00  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0     A   15      Required for Majors  25   Graduate     0      Major        30
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99   0     B   10
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99   1     C    1      General               0   Under-grad  34      Non-major     4
  84-150     1       3.00-3.49   3     D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   7     F    0      Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 0
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 389  1                     University of Maryland                          Page 1402
Title        Human Behavior II                  Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Okundaye,Joshua                    Fall  2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 25                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   6   0  1  1  2  5 10  4.16  987/1509  4.16  4.47  4.31  4.32  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    6   0  1  1  1  7  9  4.16  962/1509  4.16  4.61  4.26  4.25  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   6   0  1  0  5  6  7  3.95  981/1287  3.95  4.60  4.30  4.33  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6   0  0  0  5  8  6  4.05  945/1459  4.05  4.54  4.22  4.26  4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  0  2  1  4  3  9  3.84  979/1406  3.84  4.36  4.09  4.12  3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0  1  1  3  9  5  3.84  985/1384  3.84  4.45  4.11  4.15  3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            6   0  0  1  2  7  9  4.26  749/1489  4.26  4.63  4.17  4.14  4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled                  6   0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1  1  0  0  5  7  4.31  579/1463  4.31  4.24  4.09  4.08  4.31


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0  0  2  0  7 10  4.32 1021/1438  4.32  4.64  4.46  4.43  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0  0  0  1  2 16  4.79  828/1421  4.79  4.81  4.73  4.73  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  1  1  4 12  4.50  617/1411  4.50  4.60  4.31  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0  1  0  0  3 14  4.61  526/1405  4.61  4.62  4.32  4.32  4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 13 0  0  2  0  1  3.67 ****/1236  ****  4.24  4.00  4.07  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46  451/1260  4.46  4.55  4.14  4.22  4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  333/1255  4.77  4.76  4.33  4.37  4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0  0  0  4 10  4.71  468/1258  4.71  4.77  4.38  4.42  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   9  0  1  0  2  1  3.75 ****/ 873  ****  4.15  4.03  4.08  ****

                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0      A   12         Required for Majors  16     Graduate     0       Major       15
  28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0      B    4
  56-83      5        2.00-2.99    0      C    0         General               0     Under-grad  25       Non-major   10
  84-150     2        3.00-3.49    6      D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    6      F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 390  1                 University of Maryland                                    Page 1403
Title         Spec Topics:Socl Welfa        Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Rohrbach,Alison               Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   11
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
        ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   303/1509  4.92  4.47  4.31  4.32  4.75
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1509  5.00  4.61  4.26  4.25  5.00
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   2  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   183/1287  4.90  4.60  4.30  4.33  4.83
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   1  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   121/1459  4.95  4.54  4.22  4.26  4.86
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  5  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1406  4.82  4.36  4.09  4.12  5.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 0 2 5  4.38   479/1384  4.41  4.45  4.11  4.15  4.38
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1489  5.00  4.63  4.17  4.14  5.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00     1/1506  5.00  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 0 1 3 3  3.88  1006/1463  4.16  4.24  4.09  4.08  3.88


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1438  4.95  4.64  4.46  4.43  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1421  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.73  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1411  4.83  4.60  4.31  4.29  5.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1405  5.00  4.62  4.32  4.32  5.00
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00     1/1236  4.44  4.24  4.00  4.07  5.00


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1260  4.67  4.55  4.14  4.22  5.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1255  5.00  4.76  4.33  4.37  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 4  5.00     1/1258  5.00  4.77  4.38  4.42  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  8   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 873  2.80  4.15  4.03  4.08  ****


                Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.17  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36  4.30  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18  4.11  ****


                Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  89  ****  ****  4.49  4.86  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  4.67  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50  4.63  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  ****  4.38  4.73  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  3.94  ****


                Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.61  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.34  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.40  ****


                Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00  ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  5.00  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  5.00  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 390  2                     University of Maryland                             Page 1404
Title        Spec Topics:Socl Welfa             Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Okundaye,Joshua                    Fall  2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  7                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1509   4.92  4.47  4.31 4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1509   5.00  4.61  4.26 4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  167/1287   4.90  4.60  4.30 4.33  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1459   4.95  4.54  4.22 4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  112/1406   4.82  4.36  4.09 4.12  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   89/1384   4.41  4.45  4.11 4.15  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1489   5.00  4.63  4.17 4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1506   5.00  4.90  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   99/1463   4.16  4.24  4.09 4.08  4.86


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  291/1438   4.95  4.64  4.46 4.43  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1421   5.00  4.81  4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1411   4.83  4.60  4.31 4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1405   5.00  4.62  4.32 4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1056/1236   4.44  4.24  4.00 4.07  3.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1260   4.67  4.55  4.14 4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1255   5.00  4.76  4.33 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1258   5.00  4.77  4.38 4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2  2  1  0  0  2  2.80  842/ 873   2.80  4.15  4.03 4.08  2.80
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

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

Questionnaires: 6   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1509  4.92  4.47  4.31  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1509  5.00  4.61  4.26  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1287  4.90  4.60  4.30  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1459  4.95  4.54  4.22  4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   0   1   0   4  4.60  269/1406  4.82  4.36  4.09  4.12  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   0   1   0   4  4.00  807/1384  4.41  4.45  4.11  4.15  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.63  4.17  4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1   1   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 1101/1463  4.16  4.24  4.09  4.08  3.75

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1438  4.95  4.64  4.46  4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   1   0   3  4.50  617/1411  4.83  4.60  4.31  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1405  5.00  4.62  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1236  4.44  4.24  4.00  4.07  5.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  746/1260  4.67  4.55  4.14  4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1255  5.00  4.76  4.33  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1258  5.00  4.77  4.38  4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 873  2.80  4.15  4.03  4.08  ****
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SOWK 395  1                 University of Maryland                                    Page 1406
Title      Addictive Behav Patter           Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Dvorak,Michael                  Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    37
Questionnaires:  32                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies     Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   9   0  0  1  0  1 21  4.83  227/1509  4.83  4.47  4.31  4.32  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91  104/1509  4.91  4.61  4.26  4.25  4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   9   0  0  0  0  5 18  4.78  229/1287  4.78  4.60  4.30  4.33  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    9   0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91   86/1459  4.91  4.54  4.22  4.26  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  2  5 16  4.61  269/1406  4.61  4.36  4.09  4.12  4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 0 7 15  4.52  334/1384  4.52  4.45  4.11  4.15  4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9   0  0  0  1  2 20  4.83  139/1489  4.83  4.63  4.17  4.14  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9   0  0  0  0 21  2  4.09 1353/1506  4.09  4.90  4.67  4.67  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 1 0 0 5 17  4.61  248/1463  4.61  4.24  4.09  4.08  4.61


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91  197/1438  4.91  4.64  4.46  4.43  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0  0  0  0  3 19  4.86  180/1411  4.86  4.60  4.31  4.29  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0  0  0  0  3 20  4.87  217/1405  4.87  4.62  4.32  4.32  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 1 2 4 16  4.52  261/1236  4.52  4.24  4.00  4.07  4.52


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 1 3 17  4.64  330/1260  4.64  4.55  4.14  4.22  4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 0 22  5.00    1/1255  5.00  4.76  4.33  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 0 22 5.00    1/1258  5.00  4.77  4.38  4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 10  14  1  0  2  2  3  3.75  610/ 873  3.75  4.15  4.03  4.08  3.75


                  Laboratory
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****


                  Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 31 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.54  4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  90  ****  ****  4.50  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  ****  ****  4.06  3.94  ****


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 30 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  30   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 30 1 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.40  ****


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     31   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****


                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A   15      Required for Majors  2      Graduate     0      Major      12
28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    5                                 Under-grad  32      Non-major  20
56-83     5       2.00-2.99    6       C    0      General              2      Under-grad  32      Non-major  20
84-150    8       3.00-3.49    4       D    0                                 #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5       F    0      Electives           13      responses to be significant
                                       P    0
                                       I    0      Other                2
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.61	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.60	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.54	4.22	4.26	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.36	4.09	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	583/1489	4.42	4.63	4.17	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.90	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	410/1463	4.44	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.91	4.81	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.60	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.62	4.32	4.32	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.55	4.14	4.22	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.76	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.77	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	187/ 873	4.57	4.15	4.03	4.08	4.57
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	833/1509	4.32	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1509	4.65	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	491/1287	4.67	4.60	4.30	4.38	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	520/1459	4.63	4.54	4.22	4.32	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	1001/1406	4.18	4.36	4.09	4.11	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	570/1384	4.45	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	133/1489	4.72	4.63	4.17	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.90	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	452/1463	4.44	4.24	4.09	4.18	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	545/1438	4.74	4.64	4.46	4.50	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.93	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	482/1411	4.67	4.60	4.31	4.35	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	526/1405	4.63	4.62	4.32	4.34	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	2	0	1	5	3.50	984/1236	4.02	4.24	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.63	4.55	4.14	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.49	4.76	4.33	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	324/1258	4.49	4.77	4.38	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	442/ 873	4.04	4.15	4.03	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 470  2                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1409
Title      Social Work Research                Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Ting,Laura                       Fall   2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   19
Questionnaires:  15                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  1  1  1 11  4.33  800/1509  4.32  4.47  4.31  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  3 11  4.60  424/1509  4.65  4.61  4.26  4.26  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  208/1287  4.67  4.60  4.30  4.38  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  146/1459  4.63  4.54  4.22  4.32  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  313/1406  4.18  4.36  4.09  4.11  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 4 10  4.60  278/1384  4.45  4.45  4.11  4.23  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  0  0  2 12  4.60  341/1489  4.72  4.63  4.17  4.18  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 0 1 4 6  4.45  396/1463  4.44  4.24  4.09  4.18  4.45


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  0  0 13  4.79  396/1438  4.74  4.64  4.46  4.50  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  639/1421  4.93  4.81  4.73  4.76  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  0  1 13  4.73  327/1411  4.67  4.60  4.31  4.35  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  0  2 11  4.64  486/1405  4.63  4.62  4.32  4.34  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 2 0 1 12  4.53  255/1236  4.02  4.24  4.00  4.03  4.53


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 10  4.43  487/1260  4.63  4.55  4.14  4.25  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 1 1 2 1 9  4.14  851/1255  4.49  4.76  4.33  4.46  4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 1 2 1 0 10  4.14  878/1258  4.49  4.77  4.38  4.51  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   2  2  1  0  0  9  4.08  422/ 873  4.04  4.15  4.03  4.26  4.08

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0       A    3       Required for Majors  14    Graduate     0      Major       15
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    7
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99    1       C    2       General               0    Under-grad  15      Non-major    0
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    6       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  1                    University of Maryland                              Page 1410
Title      Social Work Methods II              Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Knight,Carolyn                   Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   16
Questionnaires: 15                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    4   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  339/1509  4.27  4.47  4.31  4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     4   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  192/1509  4.49  4.61  4.26  4.26  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4   9  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1287  4.50  4.60  4.30  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55  410/1459  4.55  4.54  4.22  4.32  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5   0  1  0  3  2  4  3.80 1009/1406  4.04  4.36  4.09  4.11  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  199/1384  4.47  4.45  4.11  4.23  4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  341/1489  4.57  4.63  4.17  4.18  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   7   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  642/1506  4.93  4.90  4.67  4.67  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5  0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  325/1463  4.13  4.24  4.09  4.18  4.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  545/1438  4.45  4.64  4.46  4.50  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  537/1421  4.74  4.81  4.73  4.76  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  243/1411  4.57  4.60  4.31  4.35  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  285/1405  4.44  4.62  4.32  4.34  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5   5  1  0  0  0  4  4.20  536/1236  3.68  4.24  4.00  4.03  4.20


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  150/1260  4.54  4.55  4.14  4.25  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1255  4.83  4.76  4.33  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  398/1258  4.76  4.77  4.38  4.51  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  152/ 873  4.26  4.15  4.03  4.26  4.67


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  4.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.54  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    13  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.19  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.07  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0        A    5      Required for Majors   9     Graduate     0      Major      11
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0        B    5                                                    
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    1        C    0      General               0     Under-grad  15     Non-major   4
  84-150    3       3.00-3.49    2        D    0                                                    
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    1        F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  2                    University of Maryland                              Page 1411
Title          Social Work Methods II          Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Bembry,James X                  Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  12  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  218/1509  4.27  4.47  4.31  4.39  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1509  4.49  4.61  4.26  4.26  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  12  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1287  4.50  4.60  4.30  4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1459  4.55  4.54  4.22  4.32  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  683/1406  4.04  4.36  4.09  4.11  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  349/1384  4.47  4.45  4.11  4.23  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           12  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  133/1489  4.57  4.63  4.17  4.18  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                 12  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  722/1506  4.93  4.90  4.67  4.67  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00  ****/1463  4.13  4.24  4.09  4.18  ****


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1438  4.45  4.64  4.46  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1421  4.74  4.81  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1411  4.57  4.60  4.31  4.35  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1405  4.44  4.62  4.32  4.34  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1236  3.68  4.24  4.00  4.03  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  187/1260  4.54  4.55  4.14  4.25  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1255  4.83  4.76  4.33  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1258  4.76  4.77  4.38  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 12  2  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  ****/ 873  4.26  4.15  4.03  4.26  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  3                    University of Maryland                          Page 1412
Title          Social Work Methods II          Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Ting,Laura                      Fall  2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires:  22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  0  5 10  5  3.86 1251/1509  4.27 4.47  4.31 4.39  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  7 10  4.29  828/1509  4.49 4.61  4.26 4.26  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  19  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1287  4.50 4.60  4.30 4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  7 10  4.29  737/1459  4.55 4.54  4.22 4.32  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  4  8  8  4.05  783/1406  4.04 4.36  4.09 4.11  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1  2  7 11  4.33  531/1384  4.47 4.45  4.11 4.23  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  4  3 13  4.45  541/1489  4.57 4.63  4.17 4.18  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 21  5.00    1/1506  4.93 4.90  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 12 2  4.07  820/1463  4.13 4.24  4.09 4.18  4.07


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  4  7  9  4.25 1071/1438  4.45 4.64  4.46 4.50  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  5 16  4.76  863/1421  4.74 4.81  4.73 4.76  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  8 10  4.33  810/1411  4.57 4.60  4.31 4.35  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  2  7  2 10  3.95 1089/1405  4.44 4.62  4.32 4.34  3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 5 0 2  7  3  3  3.47 1002/1236  3.68 4.24  4.00 4.03  3.47


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0  2  8  9  4.37  535/1260  4.54 4.55  4.14 4.25  4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0  0  5 14  4.74  367/1255  4.83 4.76  4.33 4.46  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 6 13 4.68  493/1258  4.76 4.77  4.38 4.51  4.68
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  1  1  1  8  6  4.00  442/ 873  4.26 4.15  4.03 4.26  4.00


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  48  **** ****  4.39 4.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  48  **** ****  4.41 4.54  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.51 4.51  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19  1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.18 4.19  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  44  **** ****  4.32 4.07  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: SOWK 481  4                 University of Maryland                              Page 1413
Title          Social Work Methods II       Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Rockwood,Jane M              Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
                 -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  1  1  3  6  3  3.64 1349/1509  4.27  4.47  4.31  4.39  3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  2  6  5  3.87 1189/1509  4.49  4.61  4.26  4.26  3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  519/1287  4.50  4.60  4.30  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  3  3  8  4.36  667/1459  4.55  4.54  4.22  4.32  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  3  4  7  4.13  711/1406  4.04  4.36  4.09  4.11  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  1  1  5  8  4.33  531/1384  4.47  4.45  4.11  4.23  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  1 10  4.40  597/1489  4.57  4.63  4.17  4.18  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1506  4.93  4.90  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 3  5  3  3.83 1036/1463  4.13  4.24  4.09  4.18  3.83


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  3  7  3  3.86 1282/1438  4.45  4.64  4.46  4.50  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31 1275/1421  4.74  4.81  4.73  4.76  4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  0  1  6  6  4.14  971/1411  4.57  4.60  4.31  4.35  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  2  2  4  6  4.00 1047/1405  4.44  4.62  4.32  4.34  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2  2  7  1  3.38 1038/1236  3.68  4.24  4.00  4.03  3.38


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  2  2  3  7  4.07  722/1260  4.54  4.55  4.14  4.25  4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  526/1255  4.83  4.76  4.33  4.46  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 1  0  3 10  4.57  570/1258  4.76  4.77  4.38  4.51  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   4  1  1  0  1  6  4.11  411/ 873  4.26  4.15  4.03  4.26  4.11


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    2        0.00-0.99   1       A   12       Required for Majors  14    Graduate     0      Major       13
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B    1
  56-83    1        2.00-2.99   1       C    0       General               0    Under-grad  15      Non-major    2
  84-150   1        3.00-3.49   4       D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   5       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```