Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 200 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	30
Title:	Soc Issues Soc Action		Questionnaires:	30
Instructor:	Guzman,Jessica			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	2	23	4.92	128/1528	4.92	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	105/1527	4.92	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	132/1333	4.91	4.68	4.34	4.40	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	81/1495	4.92	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	168/1439	4.75	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	106/1425	4.87	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.68	4.18	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	41/1490	4.95	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	199/1428	4.92	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	464/1436	4.91	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	138/1427	4.91	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	208/1425	4.87	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	72/1291	4.91	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	197/1271	4.81	4.57	4.16	4.21	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.70	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.75	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/922	5.00	4.28	4.02	4.11	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: | SOWK 200 1 | | | Term - Fall 2010 | | | | Enrollment: | 30 |

| Title: | Soc Issues Soc Action | | | | | | | Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Instructor: | Guzman,Jessica |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	30	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 240 1	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	29
Title:	Info Tech In Social Work			Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	Lopez,Christina				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	8	2	3	4	2	2.47	1518/1528	3.57	4.52	4.31	4.34	2.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	672/1527	4.61	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	13	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1333	4.93	4.68	4.34	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	2	1	3	1	2	10	4.00	1047/1495	4.38	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	1	3	3	7	3.32	1297/1439	4.07	4.38	4.11	4.12	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	1	4	1	4	3	6	3.33	1285/1425	4.08	4.57	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	2	0	1	16	4.63	318/1508	4.79	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	769/1526	4.89	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	789/1490	4.12	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	270/1428	4.82	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1260/1436	4.67	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	589/1427	4.66	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1132/1425	4.39	4.64	4.34	4.37	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	1	2	1	0	9	4.08	690/1291	4.34	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1022/1271	4.14	4.57	4.16	4.21	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	847/1276	4.44	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	754/1273	4.59	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/922	4.55	4.28	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 240 1	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	29
Title:	Info Tech In Social Work			Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	Lopez,Christina				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 240 1
Title:	Info Tech In Social Work
Instructor:	Lopez,Christina

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 240 3		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Info Tech In Social Work				Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Morris,Katherin				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	434/1528	3.57	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	237/1527	4.61	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	103/1333	4.93	4.68	4.34	4.40	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	217/1495	4.38	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	122/1439	4.07	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	121/1425	4.08	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	57/1508	4.79	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	4.89	4.87	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	858/1490	4.12	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	459/1428	4.82	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	310/1436	4.67	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	270/1427	4.66	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	242/1425	4.39	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	245/1291	4.34	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	334/1271	4.14	4.57	4.16	4.21	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	395/1276	4.44	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	323/1273	4.59	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	201/922	4.55	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 240 3	Term - Fall 2010								Enrollment:	27
Title:	Info Tech In Social Work									Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Morris,Katherin										

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 240 3		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	27
Title:	Info Tech In Social Work				Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Morris,Katherin					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 260 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 35
Title: Intro Social Work I		Questionnaires: 35
Instructor: Jani,Jayshree S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	419/1528	4.56	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	161/1527	4.60	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	192/1333	4.61	4.68	4.34	4.40	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	237/1495	4.36	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	205/1439	4.15	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	207/1425	4.44	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	172/1508	4.58	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	910/1526	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	0	6	17	4.58	281/1490	4.29	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1428	4.73	4.75	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	548/1436	4.78	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	110/1427	4.65	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	174/1425	4.65	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	130/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	3	21	4.72	272/1271	4.50	4.57	4.16	4.21	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	223/1276	4.68	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	118/1273	4.82	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	261/922	4.18	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 1		Term - Fall 2010								Enrollment:	35
Title:	Intro Social Work I										Questionnaires:	35
Instructor:	Jani,Jayshree S											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 1
Title:	Intro Social Work I
Instructor:	Jani,Jayshree S

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 2	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	35
Title:	Intro Social Work I			Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	Chakmakian,Elis				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	3	3	8	13	4.04	1121/1528	4.56	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	13	10	4.14	1007/1527	4.60	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	713/1333	4.61	4.68	4.34	4.40	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	1196/1495	4.36	4.56	4.25	4.28	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	9	11	4.11	788/1439	4.15	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	13	10	4.19	746/1425	4.44	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	10	12	4.11	959/1508	4.58	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	453/1526	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	6	11	5	3.68	1191/1490	4.29	4.41	4.11	4.11	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	11	12	4.22	1100/1428	4.73	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	5	18	4.44	1229/1436	4.78	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	9	13	4.27	908/1427	4.65	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	8	14	4.15	1013/1425	4.65	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	5	6	10	3.80	902/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	4.14	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	6	6	11	3.88	880/1271	4.50	4.57	4.16	4.21	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	675/1276	4.68	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	480/1273	4.82	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	3	19	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	****/922	4.18	4.28	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 2
Title:	Intro Social Work I
Instructor:	Chakmakian,Elis

Term - Fall 2010

| Enrollment: | 35 |
| Questionnaires: | 29 |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	1	Major	22
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 2
Title:	Intro Social Work I
Instructor:	Chakmakian,Elis

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

P   0   to be significant

I   0   Other   0

?   3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 3	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	33
Title:	Intro Social Work I			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Eisenberg,David				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	5	22	4.71	362/1528	4.56	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	161/1527	4.60	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	5	20	4.50	564/1333	4.61	4.68	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	350/1495	4.36	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	446/1439	4.15	4.38	4.11	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	7	16	4.46	442/1425	4.44	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	172/1508	4.58	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	654/1526	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	243/1490	4.29	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	422/1428	4.73	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	27	4.89	548/1436	4.78	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	378/1427	4.65	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	349/1425	4.65	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	4	19	4.48	346/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	4.14	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	327/1271	4.50	4.57	4.16	4.21	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	339/1276	4.68	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	257/1273	4.82	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	2	0	1	5	6	3.93	534/922	4.18	4.28	4.02	4.11	3.93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 3
Title:	Intro Social Work I
Instructor:	Eisenberg,David

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	4	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 3		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	33
Title:	Intro Social Work I					Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Eisenberg,David						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	0	to be significant			
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 4	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 29
Title:	Intro Social Work I			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Belcher,John			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	238/1528	4.56	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	514/1527	4.60	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	351/1333	4.61	4.68	4.34	4.40	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	2	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	879/1495	4.36	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	5	3	4	6	3.35	1285/1439	4.15	4.38	4.11	4.12	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	513/1425	4.44	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	295/1508	4.58	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	283/1526	4.85	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	675/1490	4.29	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	237/1428	4.73	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	516/1436	4.78	4.85	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	364/1427	4.65	4.70	4.32	4.33	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	277/1425	4.65	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	13	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/1291	4.35	4.21	4.05	4.14	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	246/1271	4.50	4.57	4.16	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	450/1276	4.68	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	18	4.75	408/1273	4.82	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/922	4.18	4.28	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 4		Term - Fall 2010				Enrollment: 29
Title:	Intro Social Work I						Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Belcher,John						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 260 4	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Social Work I			Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	Belcher,John				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 360 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 44
Title: Soc Welfare/Pol/Work II		Questionnaires: 44
Instructor: Tice,Carolyn J		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			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	2	8	29	4.69	390/1528	4.69	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	4	32	4.74	269/1527	4.74	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	32	4.77	282/1333	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	8	28	4.68	295/1495	4.68	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	283/1439	4.62	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	3	4	29	4.51	386/1425	4.51	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.51
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	4	34	4.82	134/1508	4.82	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	1	0	5	20	4.56	305/1490	4.56	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	35	4.92	199/1428	4.92	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	35	4.92	464/1436	4.92	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	31	4.78	320/1425	4.78	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	1	2	4	28	4.58	267/1291	4.58	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	197/1271	4.82	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	190/1276	4.91	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	1	30	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	205/922	4.53	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 360 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 44
Title:	Soc Welfare/Pol/Work II		Questionnaires: 44
Instructor:	Tice,Carolyn J		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 360 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 44
Title:	Soc Welfare/Pol/Work II		Questionnaires: 44
Instructor:	Tice,Carolyn J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	33
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 373 1	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Demystifying the DSM			Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Okundaye,Joshua				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	112/1528	4.94	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	143/1527	4.88	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	174/1333	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	169/1495	4.81	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	168/1439	4.75	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	106/1425	4.87	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	114/1508	4.87	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.93	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	404/1490	4.46	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	270/1428	4.88	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	361/1436	4.94	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	96/1427	4.94	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	197/1425	4.88	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1106/1291	3.36	4.21	4.05	4.09	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	197/1271	4.81	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	483/1276	4.63	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	245/922	4.45	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.45

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 373 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Demystifying the DSM		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Okundaye,Joshua		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	10				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 387 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 30
Title: Pol/Prog/Serv:Children		Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Demidenko,Micha		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	230/1528	4.81	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	134/1527	4.88	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	201/1333	4.85	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	217/1495	4.77	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	2	2	1	18	4.24	668/1439	4.24	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	116/1425	4.85	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	0	1	24	4.85	124/1508	4.85	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	283/1526	4.96	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	312/1490	4.55	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.75	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	110/1427	4.92	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	197/1425	4.88	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	174/1291	4.71	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	1	20	4.58	381/1271	4.58	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	395/1276	4.71	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	234/922	4.47	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 387 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 30
Title: Pol/Prog/Serv:Children		Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Demidenko,Micha		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 387 1		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	30
Title:	Pol/Prog/Serv:Children					Questionnaires:	30
Instructor:	Demidenko,Micha						

					Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced															

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 388 1	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	39
Title:	Human Behavior			Questionnaires:	39
Instructor:	Okundaye,Joshua				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	1	0	3	7	14	4.32	845/1528	4.47	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	607/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	2	4	7	12	4.16	898/1333	4.37	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	528/1495	4.39	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	6	3	14	4.25	657/1439	4.37	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	396/1425	4.49	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	517/1508	4.54	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	283/1526	4.81	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	464/1490	4.27	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	909/1428	4.61	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	996/1436	4.75	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	669/1427	4.50	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	667/1425	4.56	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	10	4	1	2	1	4	3.00	1194/1291	3.82	4.21	4.05	4.09	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	639/1271	4.44	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	3	1	13	4.44	654/1276	4.55	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	584/1273	4.62	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	675/922	3.75	4.28	4.02	4.02	3.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

| Term - Fall 2010 |

| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 39 |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	20						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 388 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 40
Title: Human Behavior		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor: Chakmakian,Elis		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	12	18	4.41	752/1528	4.47	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	2	10	22	4.59	477/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	9	24	4.68	383/1333	4.37	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	5	14	15	4.23	879/1495	4.39	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	4	11	18	4.32	583/1439	4.37	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	6	11	16	4.30	613/1425	4.49	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	380/1508	4.54	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	18	16	4.47	1091/1526	4.81	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	21	10	4.28	639/1490	4.27	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	497/1428	4.61	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	774/1436	4.75	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	323/1427	4.50	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	378/1425	4.56	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	0	3	9	18	4.28	518/1291	3.82	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	7	7	18	4.34	591/1271	4.44	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.34
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	6	23	4.59	514/1276	4.55	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	458/1273	4.62	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	3	0	4	9	5	3.62	685/922	3.75	4.28	4.02	4.02	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 388 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 40
Title:	Human Behavior		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor:	Chakmakian,Elis		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.80	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 388 2
Title:	Human Behavior
Instructor:	Chakmakian,Elis

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	40

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	40	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 388 3	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 32
Title:	Human Behavior			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Okundaye,Joshua			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	405/1528	4.47	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	575/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	816/1333	4.37	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	544/1495	4.39	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	352/1439	4.37	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	249/1425	4.49	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	380/1508	4.54	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1526	4.81	4.87	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	833/1490	4.27	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	718/1428	4.61	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	980/1436	4.75	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	891/1427	4.50	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	741/1425	4.56	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	614/1291	3.82	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	280/1271	4.44	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	494/1276	4.55	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	584/1273	4.62	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	467/922	3.75	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 388 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 32
Title: Human Behavior		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Okundaye,Joshua		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 388 3	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 32
Title:	Human Behavior			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Okundaye,Joshua			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 389 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 22
Title: Human Behavior II		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Okundaye,Joshua		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	80/1528	4.95	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1527	5.00	4.67	4.28	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	147/1333	4.90	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	51/1495	4.95	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	50/1439	4.95	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.57	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.68	4.18	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	283/1526	4.95	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.41	4.11	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	303/1428	4.85	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.85	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	69/1427	4.95	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.64	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1291	****	4.21	4.05	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	146/1271	4.89	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	257/1276	4.84	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.75	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	158/922	4.67	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 389 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 22
Title: Human Behavior II		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Okundaye,Joshua		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 389 1		Term - Fall 2010				Enrollment: 22
Title:	Human Behavior II						Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Okundaye,Joshua						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	1	to be significant			
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 390 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 4
Title: Spec Topics:Socl Welfare		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Rohrbach,Alison		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	5.00	1/1528	4.92	4.52	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1527	4.75	4.67	4.28	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	227/1495	4.75	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1439	4.50	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1508	4.78	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1526	4.90	4.87	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	221/1490	4.83	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1428	4.90	4.75	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	4.90	4.85	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.90	4.70	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	4.90	4.64	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1291	4.75	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1271	4.83	4.57	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	4.83	4.70	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/922	4.75	4.28	4.02	4.02	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 390 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 4
Title: Spec Topics:Socl Welfare		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Rohrbach,Alison		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/76	5.00	5.00	4.27	3.68	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	3.94	4.27	5.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	5.00	4.74	4.80	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	32/32	1.00	1.00	4.20	3.38	1.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	42/43	3.00	3.00	4.43	3.75	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.75	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/36	5.00	5.00	4.43	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 390 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 7
Title: Spec Topics:Socl Welfare		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Rohrbach,Alison		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1528	4.92	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1527	4.75	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	294/1333	4.88	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	227/1495	4.75	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1439	4.50	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	144/1508	4.78	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	742/1526	4.90	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	4.83	4.41	4.11	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	385/1428	4.90	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1436	4.90	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1427	4.90	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	277/1425	4.90	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1291	4.75	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	319/1271	4.83	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	439/1276	4.83	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	218/922	4.75	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 390 3	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	7
Title:	Spec Topics:Socl Welfare			Questionnaires:	7
Instructor:	Rohrbach,Alison				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	5.00	5.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	5.00	5.00	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	5.00	5.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	1.00	1.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	3.00	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	5.00	5.00	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 390 3
Title:	Spec Topics:Socl Welfare
Instructor:	Rohrbach,Alison

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
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 responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 395 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 40
Title: Addictive Behav Patterns		Questionnaires: 40
Instructor: Dvorak,Michael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	265/1528	4.79	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	290/1527	4.73	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	393/1333	4.67	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	323/1495	4.66	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	1	8	22	4.59	299/1439	4.59	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	275/1425	4.64	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	5	9	19	4.42	558/1508	4.42	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	227/1526	4.97	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	266/1490	4.60	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	270/1428	4.88	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	207/1436	4.97	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	165/1427	4.88	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	163/1425	4.91	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	3	8	20	4.55	297/1291	4.55	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	357/1271	4.62	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	406/1276	4.69	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	345/1273	4.81	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	360/922	4.25	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 395 1		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment: 40
Title:	Addictive Behav Patterns					Questionnaires: 40
Instructor:	Dvorak,Michael					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	24
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 397 1	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	21
Title:	Social Work Methods I			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Chakmakian,Elis				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	4	13	4.67	434/1528	4.67	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	514/1527	4.56	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.68	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	432/1495	4.56	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	459/1439	4.44	4.38	4.11	4.13	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	191/1425	4.73	4.57	4.12	4.17	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	544/1508	4.44	4.68	4.18	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	396/1526	4.94	4.87	4.66	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	464/1490	4.43	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	270/1428	4.88	4.75	4.49	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	612/1436	4.88	4.85	4.74	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	220/1427	4.81	4.70	4.32	4.31	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	349/1425	4.75	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	221/1291	4.64	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	238/1271	4.77	4.57	4.16	4.19	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	339/1276	4.77	4.70	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	395/1273	4.77	4.75	4.38	4.40	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	284/922	4.38	4.28	4.02	4.02	4.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 397 1	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 21
Title: Social Work Methods I			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Chakmakian,Elis			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 470 1		Term - Fall 2010				Enrollment: 10						
Title: Social Work Research						Questionnaires: 10						
Instructor: Bembry,James X												

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	307/1528	4.77	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	143/1527	4.86	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	294/1333	4.66	4.68	4.34	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	407/1495	4.63	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1439	4.76	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	207/1425	4.72	4.57	4.12	4.26	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	380/1508	4.65	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1526	4.97	4.87	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1490	4.50	4.41	4.11	4.19	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	478/1428	4.85	4.75	4.49	4.54	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	4.94	4.85	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	297/1427	4.73	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	349/1425	4.79	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	728/1291	4.33	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1271	4.74	4.57	4.16	4.33	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1276	4.74	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1273	4.69	4.75	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	218/922	4.42	4.28	4.02	4.23	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 470 1		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	10
Title:	Social Work Research					Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Bembry,James X						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 470 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Social Work Research		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Ting,Laura		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	265/1528	4.77	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	170/1527	4.86	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	489/1333	4.66	4.68	4.34	4.37	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	295/1495	4.63	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	222/1439	4.76	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	199/1425	4.72	4.57	4.12	4.26	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	220/1508	4.65	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	340/1526	4.97	4.87	4.66	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	911/1490	4.50	4.41	4.11	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	133/1428	4.85	4.75	4.49	4.54	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	580/1436	4.94	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	364/1427	4.73	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	254/1425	4.79	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	205/1291	4.33	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	349/1271	4.74	4.57	4.16	4.33	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	483/1276	4.74	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	746/1273	4.69	4.75	4.38	4.55	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	316/922	4.42	4.28	4.02	4.23	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 470 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Social Work Research		Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Ting,Laura			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title: Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Knight,Carolyn		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	160/1528	4.21	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	4.34	4.68	4.34	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	746/1495	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	851/1439	4.17	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1425	4.48	4.57	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	448/1508	4.63	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	919/1526	4.75	4.87	4.66	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	90/1490	4.17	4.41	4.11	4.19	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	221/1428	4.54	4.75	4.49	4.54	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1427	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	277/1425	4.33	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	3.44	4.21	4.05	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	152/1271	4.43	4.57	4.16	4.33	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	212/1276	4.71	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1273	4.72	4.75	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	158/922	4.00	4.28	4.02	4.23	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 481 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title:	Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Knight,Carolyn		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 481 2							Term - Fall 2010						Enrollment: 18	
Title:	Social Work Methods II													Questionnaires: 18	
Instructor:	Bembry,James X														

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	1	11	4.38	795/1528	4.21	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	501/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1333	4.34	4.68	4.34	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1495	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	0	6	7	4.13	770/1439	4.17	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	339/1425	4.48	4.57	4.12	4.26	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	390/1508	4.63	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	900/1526	4.75	4.87	4.66	4.71	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	0	12	4.60	266/1490	4.17	4.41	4.11	4.19	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	898/1428	4.54	4.75	4.49	4.54	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	420/1427	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	556/1425	4.33	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1291	3.44	4.21	4.05	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	296/1271	4.43	4.57	4.16	4.33	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	339/1276	4.71	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	395/1273	4.72	4.75	4.38	4.55	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	436/922	4.00	4.28	4.02	4.23	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 2	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Bembry,James X		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Ting,Laura		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	0	5	5	3	3.47	1418/1528	4.21	4.52	4.31	4.39	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	639/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1333	4.34	4.68	4.34	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	903/1495	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1197/1439	4.17	4.38	4.11	4.20	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	1101/1425	4.48	4.57	4.12	4.26	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	284/1508	4.63	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	742/1526	4.75	4.87	4.66	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1149/1490	4.17	4.41	4.11	4.19	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1250/1428	4.54	4.75	4.49	4.54	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1102/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	792/1427	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	1	1	7	3.83	1193/1425	4.33	4.64	4.34	4.37	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	5	1	1	0	2	2.22	1274/1291	3.44	4.21	4.05	4.10	2.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	2	5	3.57	1049/1271	4.43	4.57	4.16	4.33	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	633/1276	4.71	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	839/1273	4.72	4.75	4.38	4.55	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	2	1	6	0	3	3.08	851/922	4.00	4.28	4.02	4.23	3.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Ting,Laura		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	****	4.23	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 3	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Ting,Laura		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 4	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title: Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Rockwood,Jane M		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1090/1528	4.21	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	575/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	634/1333	4.34	4.68	4.34	4.37	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	313/1495	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	239/1439	4.17	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	249/1425	4.48	4.57	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	85/1508	4.63	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	919/1526	4.75	4.87	4.66	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1227/1490	4.17	4.41	4.11	4.19	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	637/1428	4.54	4.75	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	742/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	463/1427	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	870/1425	4.33	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	376/1291	3.44	4.21	4.05	4.10	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	497/1271	4.43	4.57	4.16	4.33	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	376/1276	4.71	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	235/1273	4.72	4.75	4.38	4.55	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	201/922	4.00	4.28	4.02	4.23	4.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 481 4	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title:	Social Work Methods II		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Rockwood,Jane M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 481 5	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 14
Title:	Social Work Methods II			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Rockwood,Jane M			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	962/1528	4.21	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	795/1527	4.52	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	843/1333	4.34	4.68	4.34	4.37	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.56	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	367/1439	4.17	4.38	4.11	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	442/1425	4.48	4.57	4.12	4.26	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	448/1508	4.63	4.68	4.18	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1526	4.75	4.87	4.66	4.71	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	911/1490	4.17	4.41	4.11	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	478/1428	4.54	4.75	4.49	4.54	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	742/1436	4.86	4.85	4.74	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	1048/1427	4.53	4.70	4.32	4.37	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1051/1425	4.33	4.64	4.34	4.37	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	3	0	2	5	3.64	1008/1291	3.44	4.21	4.05	4.10	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	421/1271	4.43	4.57	4.16	4.33	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	406/1276	4.71	4.70	4.33	4.49	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	480/1273	4.72	4.75	4.38	4.55	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	691/922	4.00	4.28	4.02	4.23	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	SOWK 481 5
Title:	Social Work Methods II
Instructor:	Rockwood,Jane M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	****	4.23	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	5.00	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	5.00	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	1.00	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	3.00	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	5.00	4.43	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: SOWK 481 5	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 14	
Title: Social Work Methods II			Questionnaires: 14	
Instructor: Rockwood,Jane M				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						