Course-Section: SOWK 200 1 University of Maryland Page 1390 Title Soc Issues Soc Action Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Title Soc Issues Soc Action
Instructor: Okundaye, Joshua

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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
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 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
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 4.01 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
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
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
1. 21d cond cyaladdon leilead and chipedoda godis
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
•
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

Other

0

P 0

0

I 0

Course-Section: SOWK 240 1 University of Maryland Title Info Tech In Social Wo

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Lopez,Christina

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 26

Page 1391 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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 a	are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Info Tech In Social Wo

Title Info Tech In Soc Instructor: Lopez, Christina

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1392 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	0	0	0	4	2	1 /	4 40	635/1500	4 45	4 47	4 21	1 21	4 40
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	5	U	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		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. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5 6	0 0	0	0 1	2 4	4 2	15 13	4.62 4.35	,	4.56 4.59	4.54	4.22 4.09	4.30	4.62
-			-						486/1406		4.36			
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	505/1384		4.45	4.11	4.09	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60		4.63	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0 5	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	U	U	0	5	10	Τ	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	- ,		4.15	4.03		4.61
1. Wele special teelmiques successivi	O	2	O	O	4	3	13	1.01	1737 073	1.15	1.15	1.05	1.01	1.01
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	, -	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 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	, 10	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced	0.0	_	-		•	_	_	2 ==		4.7	4.4.1.1	4 05	4 22	4.4.1.1
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75		****	****	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

Instructor: Lopez, Christina

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1392 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Info Tech In Social Wo

Title Instructor: Morris,Katherin

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 24

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1393 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

				-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		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		4.15	4.03		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		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 104			1.10	4.02	
Seminar	0.0	0	0	0	0	0		F 00	***** / 00	ale ale ale ale	de de de de	4 40	F 00	de de de de
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 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		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	des Reasons		Туре		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	В 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	3
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	n
				P 0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I 0	Other	0	-	-	-	

? 0

SOMV 700 I

Title Intro Social Work I Instructor: Sanders Baffour

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1394 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	4	0	0	0	_	1 2	1 -	4 00	1050/1500	4 54	4 47	4 21	4 24	4 00
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	4 4	0	2	0	6 8	13 9	15 17		1058/1509 1027/1509		4.47 4.61	4.31 4.26	4.34 4.32	4.08 4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	10	22	4.50			4.60	4.20	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	2	3	6		11		1177/1459		4.54	4.22	4.30	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	4		14	4.09	753/1406		4.36	4.22	4.30	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	5	14			1017/1384		4.45	4.11	4.09	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	1	3		17	4.17			4.43	4.17	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	35		175/1506		4.90	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	0	11	13	5		1268/1463		4.24	4.09	4.01	3.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	4	U	ТТ	13	5	3.45	1200/1403	4.15	4.24	4.09	4.00	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	,			4.33	4.37	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	11	17	4.32	,		4.77	4.38	4.44	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	1	8	10	8	3.63				4.03	4.04	3.63
1. Were special teciniques successivi		_	5	_	O	10	O	3.03	0007 073	1.21	1.15	1.05	1.01	3.03
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	2.0	•	0	_	•	0	-	F 00		de de de de	ate ate ate ate	4 20	4 50	****
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	****	****

Title Intro Social Work I

Instructor: Sanders Baffour

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1394 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	18	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Title Intro Social Work I

Instructor: Acquavita, Shaun

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 28

Grad.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1395 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did	vou gain	new insights, ski	_	om this course	1	0	0	Ο	1	3	23	4.81	235/1509	4.54	4.47	4.31	4.34	4.81
		ructor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	234/1509	4.51	4.61	4.26	4.32	4.78
		questions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	240/1287	4.69	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.78
		aluations reflect		-	1	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	324/1459	4.25	4.54	4.22	4.30	4.63
		readings contrib			2	0	0	1	3	5	17	4.46	377/1406	4.38	4.36	4.09	4.09	4.46
	_	_		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
		ing system clearl		_	2	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	127/1489	4.54	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.85
	_	es was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	233/1506	4.96	4.90	4.67	4.61	4.96
	-			ching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	489/1463	4.15	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.39
				. 5									,					
1		Lectur		,		0	0	0	0	-	0.0	4 06	110/1420	4 60	1 61	4 46	4 40	4 06
		tructor's lecture			4	0	0	0	0	Τ	23	4.96	110/1438	4.69	4.64	4.46	4.48	4.96
		ructor seem inter		_	3	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	794/1421	4.78	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.80
		material presente		-	4	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	255/1411	4.54	4.60	4.31	4.37	4.79
		ures contribute t		*	3	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	239/1405	4.55	4.62	4.32	4.39	4.84
5. Did	audiovis	ual techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	22	4.76	121/1236	4.49	4.24	4.00	4.11	4.76
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class di	scussions contrib	ute 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	e all stu	dents actively en	courage	ed 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 inst	ructor encourage	fair ar	nd 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	e special	techniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	109/ 873	4.21	4.15	4.03	4.04	4.77
		Labora	torv															
1 Did	the lah	increase understa	-	of the material	27	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
			_	ground information		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Z. WCI	c you pro	viaca with aacqua	cc bacı	iground informacion	2,	O	O	Ü	O	O	_	3.00	/ 100			1.22	1.51	
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credita	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
		0.00.0.00												 -				1.0
00-27	∠ 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17		кес	quire	ea fo	or Ma	ıjor	S 2	. 3	Graduat	=	0	Majo)r.	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 5		a		1				0	TT		10	Man		1.0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	28	Non-	-major	10
84-15	0 0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

3.50-4.00 4

0

0

0

0

Eisenberg,David

University of Maryland

Intro Social Work I

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Enrollment: 40

Title

Instructor:

Page 1396 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 39 Student Cou	ırse	Evalı	atio	on Qı	ıest	ionn	aire	!						
			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

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

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

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													
								4.00 ****/ 177					
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														
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	Ω	Ω	Ω	1	5.00 ****/	3.0	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency	Distribution
Frequency	DISCIIDUCION

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	 L1	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	L6						
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	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0 .

Course-Section: SOWK 360 2 University of Maryland Title Soc Welfare/Pol/Work I Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Tice,Carolyn J

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1397

					Fre	quer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	N	R	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1 Did main man			^	0	0	0	0	2	10	4 00	044/1500	4 00	1 17	1 21	4 20	4 00
1 3	insights, skills from this co		.0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.80
	or make clear the expected go		9	0	0	0	0	Ţ	15	4.94	81/1509	4.94	4.61	4.26	4.25	4.94
_	stions reflect the expected	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1287	4.87	4.60	4.30	4.33	4.87
	ions reflect the expected go		0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.54	4.22	4.26	4.80
_	lings contribute to what you		0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	175/1406	4.73	4.36	4.09	4.12	4.73
-	nments contribute to what yo		0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.80
3 3	system clearly explained		2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.63	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times wa		1	-	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.90	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you gra	de the overall teaching effe	ectiveness 1	2	1	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	263/1463	4.58	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.58
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.43	5.00
	or seem interested in the sul		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.73	5.00
	rial presented and explained	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.60	4.31	4.29	5.00
	contribute to what you learn	-		0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1405	4.93	4.62	4.32	4.32	4.93
	echniques enhance your under		0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1236		4.24	4.00	4.07	
J. Dia addiovibuai c	cominques emianee your under	r beariaring i	. •	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü		3.00	1,1230	3.00	1.21	1.00	1.07	3.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to what you	learned 1	1	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 part	ticipate 1	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.76	4.33	4.37	5.00
	or encourage fair and open d	_	1	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			1	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.15	4.03	4.08	4.50
	Frequen	су	Dist	ribu	tion	l										
		1	-													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expect	ted Grades				Rea	sons				Tvr	oe.			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 387 1 University of Maryland Page 1398 Title Pol/Prog/Serv:Children Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Demidenko, Micha

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	18	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 1 University of Maryland Title Human Behavior Baltimore County Instructor: Okundaye, Joshua Fall 2009

altimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1399

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 38
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: SOWK 388 1
Title Human Behavior
Instructor: Okundaye,Joshua

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1399 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_	_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 2 University of Maryland Title Human Behavior Instructor: Wiechelt, Shelly

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1400 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 35 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	ane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	4	1	6	7	11		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		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		1045/1406		4.36	4.09	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	0	4	9	11		1001/1384		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		4.90	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		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		1277/1411		4.60	4.31	4.29	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	4	4	10	8		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			4.24	4.00	4.07	3.68
Discussion	_	0	_	_		•	0	2 50	1045/1060	4 00	4 55	4 1 4	4 00	2 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	2	4	8	9		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 1	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 7	0 5	1 1	1 2	<u> </u>	5 7	20 8	4.50	620/1258	4.59	4.77	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	/	5	Τ	2	5	/	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						_	•					4 00		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 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		****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	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	****

Course-Section: SOWK 388 2 Title Human Behavior Instructor:

Wiechelt, Shelly

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1400 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Page 1401
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: SOWK 388 3

39

Human Behavior

Singleton, Hanna

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 34

	Questions					NA	Fre 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mear
		General	 l																
1. Did you	gain nev	w insights,skil	lls from t	his course	0	0	0	1	4	15	14	4.24	901/1	509	4.17	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the	instruct	tor make clear	the exped	cted goals	0	0	0	2	14	7	11		1234/1	509	4.05	4.61	4.26	4.25	3.79
	_	estions reflect	_	-	0	0	1	1	5	15	12	4.06	903/1		4.12	4.60	4.30	4.33	4.06
		ations reflect			1	0	1	3	6	12	11		1111/1		4.13	4.54	4.22	4.26	3.88
	_	adings contribu		-	1	0	0	1	4	12	16	4.30	527/1		4.15	4.36	4.09	4.12	4.30
				hat you learned	1	0	2	0	8	7	16	4.06	773/1		4.09	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.06
		system clearly		ea	1 2	0	1	4	6 0	7 0	15 32	5.00	1070/1		4.22	4.63	4.17	4.14	3.94
_		was class cance			∠ 5	2	0	1	14	9	32		1/1	506		4.90 4.24	4.67	4.67 4.08	5.00
9. HOW WOUL	.a you gi	rade the overal	II teachin	ng effectiveness	5	۷	U	1	14	9	3	3.52	123//1	403	3.82	4.24	4.09	4.08	3.54
		Lecture	е																
		ctor's lectures	_	-	1	0	1	3	4	18	7		1294/1			4.64	4.46	4.43	3.82
		tor seem intere		-	1	0	0	1	5	14	13		1314/1		4.45	4.81	4.73	4.73	4.18
	s lecture material presented and explained cled the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	3	9	14	6		1218/1		3.91	4.60	4.31	4.29	3.72
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned. d audiovisual techniques enhance your understar.				1 2	0	1	2	6	14	10		1132/1		4.07	4.62	4.32		3.91
5. Did audi	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					4	1	3	7	10	7	3.68	898/1	.236	3.61	4.24	4.00	4.07	3.68
		Discuss	sion																
		ssions contribu			1	0	0	1	4	13	15	4.27	605/1	260	4.08	4.55	4.14	4.22	4.27
		ts actively end	_		1	0	1	0	6	7	19	4.30	749/1		4.45	4.76	4.33	4.37	4.30
		_		pen discussion	2	0	0	2	3	4	23	4.50	620/1		4.59	4.77	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succes	ssful		1	2	1	1	5	14	10	4.00	442/	873	3.98	4.15	4.03	4.08	4.00
		Seminar	r																
1. Were ass	signed to	opics relevant	to the ar	nounced theme	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	89	****	****	4.49	4.86	***
				dual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	****	****	4.54	4.67	***
	_	ojects contribu		-	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	90	****	****	4.50	4.63	***
_		ns contribute t	_	ou learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	****	****	4.38	4.73	***
5. Were cri	teria fo	or grading made	e clear		33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	93	****	****	4.06	3.94	***
		Self I	Paced																
1. Did self	-paced	system contribu	ute to wha	it you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
2. Did stud	ly quest:	ions make clear	r the expe	ected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	41	****	****	4.14	5.00	***
		cts with the ir			32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	46	****	****	4.31	5.00	***
		k/tutoring by p			32	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.50	,	37	****	****	4.05	5.00	***
5. Were the	ere enoug	gh proctors for	r all the	students	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.27	5.00	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utic	n										
Credits Ear	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s				Туј	pe			Majors	3			
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 15															0			 30
00-27 28-55	1	1.00-0.99	0	A 15 B 10		Kec	1ulre	eu I	or M	a jor	5 Z	د	Grad	udi	=	U	Majo)T	30
56-83							nera:	1				0	Unde	r-c	rad ?	4	Non-	-major	4
	34-150 1 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						тста.	-				U	onde	. <u> </u>	Luu 3	1	11011-	iia jui	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	####	: - T	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ah
P 0												-			es to b			_	,
	I 0						ner					0	_ 55P					-	
	? 1																		

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Frequencies

University of Maryland Page 1402 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

A. 1 .			
Student	('Ollrge	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: SOWK 389 1

27

Human Behavior II

Okundaye,Joshua

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

	Questions						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course		б	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	987/1509	4.16	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.16
		ctor make clear				б	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	962/1509	4.16	4.61	4.26	4.25	4.16
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals		б	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	981/1287	3.95	4.60	4.30	4.33	3.95
4. Did oth	ner evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	(б	0	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	945/1459	4.05	4.54	4.22	4.26	4.05
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	(б	0	2	1	4	3	9	3.84	979/1406	3.84	4.36	4.09	4.12	3.84
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learn	ed	б	0	1	1	3	9	5	3.84	985/1384	3.84	4.45	4.11	4.15	3.84
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl;	y expla	ined	(б	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	749/1489	4.26	4.63	4.17	4.14	4.26
		was class canc				б	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.90	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectivene	ss 1	1	1	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	579/1463	4.31	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.31
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	2	0	7	10	4.32	1021/1438	4.32	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.32
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					6 6	0	0	0	1	2	16		828/1421		4.81		4.73	4.79
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clear					7	0	0	1	1		12		617/1411		4.60	4.31	4.29	4.50
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					7	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61		4.61	4.62	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did aud	 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand: 						13	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1236	****	4.24	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus																	
1 Did ala				what you learned	1:	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	451/1260	4.46	4.55	4.14	4.22	4.46
				d to participate			0	0	0	0	2	10	4.77	333/1255	4.77	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.40
				d co participate d open discussion			0	0	0	0	<i>3</i>	10	4.71	468/1258	4.71	4.77	4.38	4.42	4.71
		echniques succe		d open discussion	1:		9	0	1	0	2	1		****/ 873			4.03	4.08	****
i. Were bp	CCIAI C	cominques succe	SSIUI			_	,	Ü	_	O	2	_	3.73	, 073		1.15	1.05	1.00	
				Fr	equen	су	Dist	ribu	ition	ı									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	es				Rea	asons	3			Typ	e e			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12							Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	6	Graduate	<u>;</u>	0	Majo	r	15
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4																			
	56-83 5 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	neral	-				0	Under-gr	ad 2	15	Non-	major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0															_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0							Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - M				_	h
P 0													•	response	s to b	e sign	ifican	t	
	I 0						Oth	ıer					0						
? 0																			

OWN 350 1 OHIVEISICY

Spec Topics:Socl Welfa

Instructor: Rohrbach, Alison

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1403 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	-anei	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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		4.60	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		4.36	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		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		5.00	1/1236		4.24		4.07	
Discussion	_					_				4 65				
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		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	U	0	U	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	****	****	1 26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10 10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	$4.26 \\ 4.14$	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students 	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
J. WELE CHELE EHOUGH PLOCEOUS FOR ALL THE SCUGENES	Τ0	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 30			7.4/	5.00	

Title Spec Topics:Socl Welfa

Instructor: Rohr

Rohrbach, Alison

Fall 2009

Page 1403 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 390 2 University of Maryland Title Spec Topics:Socl Welfa

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Okundaye,Joshua

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1404 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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 learne	d 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 effectivenes	s 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		1056/1236		4.24	4.00	4.07	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	Λ	٥	Λ	Ω	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	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	4.42	2.80
Fre	quency	/ Dis	strik	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Re	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		 Re	 equir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 S	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1			_			J								

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: SOWK 390 3 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Spec Topics:Socl Welfa Instructor: Rohrbach, Alison Fall 2009

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

4. Were special techniques successful

4 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 873 2.80 4.15 4.03 4.08 ****

Page 1405 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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
5. 21d ddd15.15dd1 ccomingdc5 cimanoc your didc15odiaini	_	Ü	•	·	Ü	Ů	-	5.00	1,1230			1.00	1.07	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
1 and and and and open alboardion	-	•	•	Ü	-	-	_		=, =200					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 395 1

OWK 395 I University

Addictive Behav Patter Bal

Dvorak,Michael 37

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 32

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 1406 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

estionnaires:	32	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect 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		4.31		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		4.22	4.26	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	,	4.61		4.09	4.12	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	7	15 20	4.52	,	4.52		4.11	4.15	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	9 9	0	0	0	1	2 21	20 2		139/1489 1353/1506	4.83		4.17 4.67	4.14 4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	0	21 5	2 17	4.61	248/1463		4.90		4.67	4.61
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U		U	U	5	Ι/	4.01	240/1403	4.01	4.24	4.03	4.00	4.01
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	4.14	4.22	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		3.75	610/ 873				4.08	
1. Note special econityaes successful			_	Ü	_	_	3	3.73	0107 073	3.73	1.15	1.05	1.00	3.73
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	Ο	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		****/ 93	****	****	4.06		****
									,					
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	3.30	****/ 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		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
1 year concaces with one imperators helpful	-	ŭ	•	ŭ	Ŭ	ŭ	_	3.00	, 10			1.01	3.00	
From	ionas	Diet	-rih	ut i or	2									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	.5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
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						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_	•	

? 1

Course-Section: SOWK 397 1 University of Maryland Title Social Work Methods I

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Knight,Carolyn

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Page 1407 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected 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	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	3	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.60	4.30	4.33	****
		uations reflect		_	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.54	4.22	4.26	4.58
				what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	1	6		1045/1406		4.36	4.09	4.12	3.75
		-		to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	4.75
		g system clearl		ained	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	583/1489		4.63	4.17	4.14	4.42
		was class cand			3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	845/1506		4.90	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	410/1463	4.44	4.24	4.09	4.08	4.44
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.64	4.46	4.43	4.73
		ctor seem inter		_	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.91	4.81	4.73	4.73	4.91
		_		explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	/		4.60	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.62	4.32	4.32	4.91
1. Did cla	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.55	4.14	4.22	4.89
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		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 fi	eld expe	rience contribu	te to v	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	luation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the	ne instru	ctor available	for cor	nsultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To wha	it degree	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clea	r the e	expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were y	our cont	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons				Ту	ре			Majors	;
00-27 28-55	0 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 5		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Cor	nera:	1				0	Under-c	rad 1	.5	Non	-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Gel	лета.	L				U	onder-6	ıau 1		INOII-	ilia JUL	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E1	ectiv	7es				0	#### -	Means t	here :	re not	enous	rh
JI dd.	P 0				11.1						-	respons				_	,	
				I 0		O+1	ner					0	_ CDPOIL	CO L	91			
				2 0		0.01						-						

Course-Section: SOWK 470 1 University of Maryland Page 1408 Title Social Work Research Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Bembry, James X

En:

Fall 2009

Enrollment:	13			
Questionnaires:	13	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Gamena l														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.54	491/1287	4.65	4.60	4.30	4.38	4.54
-	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	520/1459	4.63	4.54	4.22	4.30	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	2	0	2	1	6		1001/1406	4.18	4.36	4.22	4.11	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 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	7	10	4.83	133/1489	4.43	4.43	4.17	4.18	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0		11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.03	4.17	4.10	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	- E	6	4.42	452/1463	4.44	4.24	4.09	4.18	4.42
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U		5	O	4.42	452/1403	4.44	4.24	4.09	4.10	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
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				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

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	N	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	е	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	s	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 lear	rned	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 le	earned	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 effective	veness	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	t	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 clear		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 understand	nding	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 lead	rned	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 the students actively encouraged to the students actively encouraged to the students active the studen		1	0	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	- ,	4.49	4.76	4.33	4.46	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus	_	1	0	1	2	1	0	10	4.14	878/1258		4.77	4.38		4.14
4. Were special techniques successful		1	2	2	1	0	0	9	4.08	422/ 873		4.15	4.03	4.26	4.08
	Frequen	ncy	Dist	rib	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected (Grades				Rea	asons	\$			ТУ	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A	 3	Required for Majors 14					 4	Graduat	 e	 0	Maio		15		

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 481 1 University of Maryland Title

Social Work Methods II Baltimore County Knight, Carolyn Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.27	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.73
_	_	tor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.49	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.82
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	4	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did otl	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.54	4.22	4.32	4.55
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	5	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1009/1406	4.04	4.36	4.09	4.11	3.80
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	199/1384	4.47	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.70
		system clearl		.ned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	341/1489	4.57	4.63	4.17	4.18	4.60
	-	was class canc			7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506		4.90	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	325/1463	4.13	4.24	4.09	4.18	4.50
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	545/1438	4.45	4.64	4.46	4.50	4.70
2. Did the	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear				5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.74	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was led					5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1411	4.57	4.60	4.31	4.35	4.80
	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 aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					5	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	536/1236	3.68	4.24	4.00	4.03	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.54	4.55	4.14	4.25	4.89
				l to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	4.83	4.76	4.33	4.46	5.00
				l 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		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 fie	eld exper	ience contribu	te to wh	at you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
				ation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for cons	sultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss your	evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did com	nferences	help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	1									
G., . 11 b		G G.7.3		Power and a discount of	_			ъ.					_				20-2-	
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	4
84-150																		
Grad.					El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h	
	P 0									•	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt			
				I 0		Other					0							
				3 0														

Page 1410

MAR 22, 2010

Course-Section: SOWK 481 2 University of Maryland Page 1411 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Social Work Methods II

Bembry, James X

Instructor: Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dep		Dept UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.27	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.83
_	_	ctor make clear			12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.49	4.61	4.26	4.26	5.00
		uestions reflec			12	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.38	****
		uations reflect			12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	4.55	4.54	4.22	4.32	5.00
				what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17		4.04	4.36	4.09	4.11	4.17
				what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	349/1384	4.47	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.50
		g system clearl		-	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1489	4.57	4.63	4.17	4.18	4.83
		was class canc			12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.93	4.90	4.67	4.67	4.83
	-			ning effectiveness	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1463		4.24	4.09	4.18	***
		T	_															
1 Wara +1	ho inatri	Lectur uctor's lecture	_	aranarad	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1438	4.45	4.64	4.46	4.50	5.00
		ctor seem inter			12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.74	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
				xplained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.57	4.60	4.31	4.75	5.00
		es contribute t		-	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	4.44	4.62	4.32	4.34	5.00
				our understanding	12	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1236				4.03	****
J. DIG GG	alovibuu.	r ccciniiqueb en	ilailee j	Jar anacrocanarny		,	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	_	3.00	, 1230	3.00	1.21	1.00	1.05	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		12	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 873	4.26	4.15	4.03	4.26	****
				Frequ	iena:	ni a	-ri bı	1+ i 01	n									
				rredo	aerre y	וסדטו	CIID	10101	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	;	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						J						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	yh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: SOWK 481 3 University of Maryland MAR 22, 2010 Title

Page 1412

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Social Work Methods II Ting,Laura

Enrollment: 22 Qυ

Instructor:

Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Р

I

0

0 0

							Frequencies					tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	5	10	5	3.86	1251/1509	4.27	4.47	4.31	4.39	3.86
		ctor make clear th		1	0	1 0	0	4	7	10	4.29	828/1509		4.61	4.26	4.26	4.29
			the expected goals	1	19	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.38	****
		uations reflect th		1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	737/1459	4.55	4.54	4.22	4.32	4.29
5. Did as	signed r	eadings 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 wr	itten as	signments contribu	ite 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	e gradin	g system clearly e	explained	2	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	541/1489	4.57	4.63	4.17	4.18	4.45
8. How man	ny times	was class cancell	_ed	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.93	4.90	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould 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	he instr	uctor's lectures w	vell 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	e instru	ctor seem interest	ed 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 le	cture ma	terial presented a	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	e lectur	es contribute to w	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 au	diovisua	l techniques enhar	nce your understanding	2	5	0	2	7	3	3	3.47	1002/1236	3.68	4.24	4.00	4.03	3.47
		Discussio	on														
			e 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
			raged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	367/1255	4.83	4.76	4.33	4.46	4.74
			r and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	493/1258		4.77	4.38	4.51	4.68
4. Were s	special to	echniques successf	ful	3	2	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	442/ 873	4.26	4.15	4.03	4.26	4.00
		Field Wor															
			to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48		****	4.39	4.75	****
			evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 48		****	4.41	4.54	****
		ctor available for		19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47		****	4.51	4.51	****
			s your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47		****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry o	out field activities	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99) A 8		Red	 quir	ed f	or M	 laior	 s 1	 5	 Graduat	 .e	0	Majo	 or	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99								_	-	2_2.2.300	-	-) ~		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99			Ger	nera	1				0	Under-9	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49					_				-	011001 9	,	-	2.011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00			Electives						0 #### - Means there are not eno					enoug	jh

Other

0

Course-Section: SOWK 481 4 University of Maryland Title Social Work Methods II Baltimore County

Instructor: Rockwood, Jane M

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1413

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies Instructor Course Dept U					UMBC	UMBC Level Sec					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	6	3		1349/1509		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
 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		1282/1438		4.64		4.50	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	7		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		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		1047/1405		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	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.07	722/1260	4.54	4.55	4.14	4.25	4.07
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	∠ 1	3	9		526/1255	4.83		4.14		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	-	0	0	Ţ	4	10	4.57 4.57	,		4.76		4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	3			570/1258	4.76	4.77	4.38	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	Τ	U	Τ	6	4.11	411/ 873	4.26	4.15	4.03	4.26	4.11
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						