Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1531 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	n n n n n

Ouestions	NR	NA		equer 2			5		tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	4	0	9	4	4	3.19	1603/1670	3.73	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	1	6	12	4.29	931/1666		4.58	4.27	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	0	0	0	0	3		****/1406		4.61	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	2	1	2	13		633/1615		4.46	4.24	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	10	1	0	2	3	3		1129/1566		4.38	4.07	4.00	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6 4	0	2	1	1 1	4	11 18		842/1528 229/1650	4.29 4.89	4.43 4.65	4.12	4.11	4.11 4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	18	3		1444/1667			4.67		4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	1	4	3	3		1473/1626			4.11		3.31
y, now would you grade one everall codeming elicociveness		_	_	_	-	J		3.31	11.3, 1020	3.77			1.00	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	896/1559	4.57	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	15		1102/1560			4.72	4.73	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2				463/1549			4.31		4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	3			1103/1546		4.63		4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	619/1323	4.48	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	1	1	6	_	2 20	1194/1384	3.93	4.48	4.10	4.07	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	878/1378			4.29	4.25	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	1	3		4.17				4.31		4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	,			4.03	4.01	
•														
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21 22	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.07	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
3 3									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
Colf Dagod														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	Λ	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Here four concaces with the instructor neighbor	23	_	_	J	5	J	U	1.00	, 21			1.01		
Frequency Distribution														
			_					_						

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	В	0						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				2	Λ.						

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1532 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	4	0	1	1	4	7	6	2 0 1	1386/1670	3.73	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.84
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7 5	13	4.63	452/1666		4.41	4.27	4.32	4.63
	4	14	0	0	0	1	4		****/1406				4.27	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals											4.61	4.32		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4 5	1 5	0	0 1	3 2	6	9	4.33	775/1615 664/1566		4.46 4.38	4.24	4.29	4.33
	5 4	1	0	0		3 6	7 9	4.23						4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3 0	0	19		631/1528		4.43	4.12	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained								5.00	1/1650		4.65	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0 2	0 1	0	0 3	15 7			1395/1667		4.63	4.67	4.64	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	Τ	U	3	/	4	3.87	1162/1626	3.77	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1178/1559	4.57	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.81	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	488/1549	4.74	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	557/1546	4.43	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	211/1323	4.48	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	683/1384	3.93	4.48	4.10	4.07	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	452/1378		4.65	4.29	4.25	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	365/1378		4.65	4.31	4.26	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	1	3	3			570/ 904		4.27	4.03	4.01	
4. Were special techniques successful	,	5	U	1	5	3	-	3.71	3707 304	3.90	1.27	1.03	4.01	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.02	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	/ 31		5.00	4.4/	4.00	
Self Paced		_				_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	***	****	4.92	****	****

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: LAUR, JOHN A.

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1532 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	 15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1533 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect					
	Ouestions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	_ :		1	0	0	1	0	2	3		1094/1670		4.41	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.59	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.86
3. Did the exam que		_	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evalua			0	0	1	0	1	1	4		1083/1615	4.26	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned read	-	-	0	0	1	1	0	4	1		1335/1566	3.81	4.38	4.07	4.00	3.43
		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.29	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.43
7. Was the grading		ained.	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.89	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.86
8. How many times wa			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	4.45	4.63	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	3.77	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.14
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.57	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.81	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture mate			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.74	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures			0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.43	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual		-	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	288/1323	4.48	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.57
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		-	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	651/1384		4.48	4.10	4.07	4.29
2. Were all students			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.86
3. Did the instruct		nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	4.66	4.65	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special tech	hniques successful		0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	356/ 904	3.96	4.27	4.03	4.01	4.29
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned to	pics relevant to th	e announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	***
2. Was the instruct			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	***
3. Did research pro			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	***
4. Did presentation	_	-	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	***
	nield Week															
5. Did conferences l	Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities					0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
5. 21d conferences .	6	0	0	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, 31		3.00	1.17	1.00			
2. Did study questi			6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16	****	****	4.67	***	***
3. Were your contact			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	***	****
4. Was the feedback		_	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
Freque					crib	ution	n									
					asons											
Credits Earned	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							3			Ty	oe .			Majors	

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

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101 University of Maryland INTRO SOCIAL WORK I Baltimore County Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN

Title

Spring 2008

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1534 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	28			
Questionnaires:	28	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions						NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l																
1. Did you	gain new	insights,ski	lls from	this course		12	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	849/1670	4.35	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the	instruct	or make clear	the exp	ected goals		13	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	686/1666	4.26	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.47
3. Did the	exam que	estions reflect	t the exp	pected goals		12	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	254/1406	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.39	4.81
4. Did othe	er evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals		12	2	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	552/1615	4.17	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assi	igned rea	adings contrib	ute to wl	hat you learne	ed	12	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	280/1566	4.46	4.38	4.07	4.00	4.69
		gnments contri		-		12	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	518/1528	4.25	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.44
		system clearly		ned		12	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	,	4.37	4.65	4.22	4.20	4.63
		as class cance				12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.39	4.63	4.67		5.00
9. How woul	ld you gr	rade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiver	ness	15	1	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1354/1626	3.70	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.58
		Lecture	2																
1. Were the	e instruc	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared		14	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1185/1559	4.27	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.21
		or seem inter	_	_		14	0	0	0	0	3	11		892/1560	4.48		4.72	4.73	4.79
3. Was lect	Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	0	3	4	7	4.29	952/1549	4.28	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.29
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1079/1546	4.32	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.13
5. Did audi	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						0	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	634/1323	4.04	4.03	4.00	4.08	4.13
		Discus	zion																
1 Did clas	ss discus	ssions contrib		hat vou learne	ed	15	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	957/1384	4.05	4.48	4.10	4.07	3.85
		s actively end				15	0	0	1	0		11	4.69	459/1378	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.69
		or encourage				15	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	501/1378	4.56	4.65	4.31		4.69
		chniques succes		open arboabb		15	4	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	138/ 904			4.03	4.01	
				I	Freque	ncy	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ear	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra-								Rea	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8							Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 aior		1	Graduate		0	Majo	r	9
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3							_			3 -						- 3		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0						Ger	neral					1	Under-gr	ad 2	8	Non-	major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Electives							1	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0										response	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
	I 0						Other 8												
	5 0																		

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1535 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

0	a	There I are to decree	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General			_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	902/1670		4.41	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	5 2	7	6		1167/1666	4.26	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	3 2	4	3 7	10 5	4.11	988/1406	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.39	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11 12	0	0	1	3	4	5 9	4.24	1276/1615 664/1566	4.17	4.46 4.38	4.24	4.29 4.00	3.83 4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.24	870/1528	4.46 4.25	4.38	4.07	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	2	9	6		1067/1650	4.25	4.43	4.12	4.11	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	1	1	4	7	5		1629/1667	4.39	4.63	4.67	4.64	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	6	8	3		1200/1626		4.22	4.11	4.06	3.82
J. Now would for grade the overall codening circultumess		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	3	3.02	1200/1020	3.70	1.22		1.00	3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1092/1559	4.27	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	1438/1560	4.48	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	960/1549	4.28	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	715/1546	4.32	4.63	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	768/1323	4.04	4.03	4.00	4.08	3.94
Discussion	1 2	0	0	0	2	_	7	4 05	670/1204	4 05	4 40	4 10	4 07	4 25
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13 13	0	0	0	3 3	6 5	7 8	4.25	670/1384 819/1378	4.05 4.50	4.48	4.10 4.29	4.07 4.25	4.25 4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	721/1378	4.50	4.65	4.29	4.25	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	808/ 904		4.05	4.03	4.20	
i. Were special techniques successivi	13	1	2	_	J	J	_	3.17	000/ 904	3.91	1.2/	1.05	1.01	3.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
									, -					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 15

I

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0201 University of Maryland Page 1536 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quen	cies			Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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

SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Title Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1537 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	•	0	2	_	_		2 50	1510/1650	4 05	4 41	4 21	4 0 4	2 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7 7	0	0 1	3 2	6 1	6 10	4 5		1518/1670		4.41 4.58	4.31	4.24	3.58
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	7	0	1	2	3	9	5 4		1357/1666 1230/1406		4.58	4.27 4.32	4.18 4.22	3.84 3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	3	3 7	4	3		1491/1615		4.46	4.24	4.18	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	11	<i>5</i>	4.28	621/1566		4.38	4.07	4.04	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	4	8	5		983/1528		4.43	4.12	4.07	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	4	4	6	4		1445/1650		4.65	4.22	4.12	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	1	3	1	10	2		1647/1667		4.63	4.67	4.67	3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	6	4	2		1312/1626			4.11		3.67
		_		-	_	_	_							
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1205/1559	4.48	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	3	3	3	9		1467/1560		4.81	4.72	4.67	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	5	6	6		1200/1549		4.64	4.31	4.25	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	7	7		1121/1546		4.63	4.32	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	2	1	5	5	2	3.27	1121/1323	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	466/1384	4.63	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	872/1378		4.65	4.29	4.30	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	721/1378		4.65	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	671/ 904		4.27	4.03		3.67
1. Note by cotal committees successful		_	_	_	J	•		3.07	0.1, 501	3.70	1.27	1.05	1.05	3.07
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar	0.5	•	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	****	****	****	4 6 4	4 50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79		****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25 25	0	0	0	0 1	0	1	5.00	****/ 75 ****/ 79	****	****	4.57 4.45	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	∠5 25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.68 3.76	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	25	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 80			3.97	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
0.35 53														
Self Paced	2.4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1 50	****/ 00	****	****	1 (1	2 22	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1 1	1 1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 28 ****/ 16	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24 24	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 16 ****/ 27	****	****	4.67 4.54	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	1	0	0	T	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.54	∠.63 ****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
3. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	41	_	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 0			1.92		
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 15

I ? Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201 University of Maryland Page 1538
Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN

Instructor: TICE, Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						NA	Fre	_	ncies	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
				_ 															
			Genera	1															
1. Di	d you	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1017/1670	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.23
2. Di	d the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	991/1666	4.31	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.23
3. Di	.d the	exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	739/1406	4.21	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Di	d othe	r evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	813/1615	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.31
					what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	559/1566	4.23	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.33
					to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	706/1528	4.28	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.25
			system clearly		ined	3	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	705/1650	4.16	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.42
	_		was class cance			3	0	1	0	0	7	4	00	1482/1667	4.16	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.08
9. Ho	w woul	d you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	499/1626	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.44
			Lecture	е															
			ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	755/1559	4.48	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.62
		n the subject	2	0	0	1	1	2	9		1279/1560	4.46	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.46			
						2	0	0	1	1	1	10		646/1549	4.33	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.54
		s lecture material presented and explained cl d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	2	2	8		1002/1546		4.63	4.32	4.24	4.23
5. Di	.d audi	ovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	1	0	3	0	9	4.23	560/1323	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.23
			Discus																
					what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	348/1384	4.63	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.64
			_	_	ed to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	571/1378	4.47	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.55
					nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	560/1378	4.61	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. We	ere spe	cial te	chniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	266/ 904	3.76	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.45
			Labora	-															
				_	of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232		****	4.19	4.04	****
2. We	ere you	provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
					Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-2		 А 5								·	Graduat		 0	Majo					
28-5		4 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 5 B 5		кес	4uır	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	B	0	Graduat	е	U	мајс	Σ	6
∠8-5 56-8		1	2.00-1.99	2	В 5 С 1		Cos	nerai	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non	mo iom	9
56-8 84-1		2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	iera.	Т				U	under-g	rau l	.5	NON-	-major	9
Grad		0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		r12	ecti	7267				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here s	re not	enous	rh
Grad	4.	5	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		17.7		v CD				J	respons					1++

Other

I 0

11

SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Title SOC WELFARE/PO Instructor: PLANELL, JOAN

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2008

Page 1539 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equen	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	165/1670	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1666	4.31	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	525/1406	4.21	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	520/1615	4.09	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	808/1566	4.23	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	315/1528	4.28	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	570/1650	4.16	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	768/1667	4.16	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	131/1626	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	706/1559	4.48	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.46	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	683/1549	4.33	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	582/1546	4.30	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1161/1323	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	249/1384	4.63	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	517/1378	4.47	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	428/1378	4.61	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	3	1	3	1	4	3.17	808/ 904	3.76	4.27	4.03	4.03	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work		_	_	_		_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced				•			_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	***	4.64	3.33	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16	****	***	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	***	4.84	***	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	***

Course-Section: SOWK 360 8620 Title

SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Instructor: PLANELL, JOAN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1539 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 371 8620 University of Maryland Page 1540 Title AGING: ISSUES, THRY, PR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LOVE, YVONNA

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							En		ncies			Tnat	migt on	Course	Dont	TIMDO	Level	Coat
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Mean	Sect Mean
		General	_			_			_		_							
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670		4.41	4.31	4.24	4.89
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.67
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	Ι.	3	5	4.44	667/1406	4.44	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.44
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	775/1615		4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.67
		-		o what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	532/1528	4.43	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.43
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.56
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	693/1626	4.29	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.29
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	971/1559	4.44	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.44
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.56
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	842/1323	3.88	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.88
		Discuss	,ion															
1 Did al-	an dina			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.67
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.40	4.10	4.12	4.07
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.78	302/1378	4.78	4.65	4.29	4.33	4.78
		chniques succes		d open discussion	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	4.69	279/ 904		4.05	4.03	4.03	4.69
4. Were St	peciai te	ciniques succes	SSLUI		U	۷	U		U	1	5	4.43	2/9/ 904	4.43	4.2/	4.03	4.03	4.43
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected (							Rea	sons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 5 B 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-1.99	0	B 3 C 0		<b>a</b>	nerai	1				6	Under-g	~~d	9	Mon	mo i o	2
84-150	2		3	D 0		Ger	iera.	Т				O	onder-g	Lau	9	NOI1-	major	2
	_	3.00-3.49		2 0		m3						^		Maa +	h			. La
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	means t	nere a	re not	enoug	n

Other

1

responses to be significant

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Section: SOWK 372 0101 Title

SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR

Instructor: HARRIS, JESSE

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 18

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1541 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	1	0	Λ	1	9	4.55	621/1670	4 50	4 41	4 31	4.24	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	4	2	5		1142/1666		4.58	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	352/1406		4.61	4.32	4.22	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	509/1615		4.46	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	7		715/1566		4.38	4.07	4.04	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	,	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50			4.43	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	2	4	5		,		4.65	4.22	4.12	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	9	1		1472/1667		4.63	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 10	0	0	0	0	6	_	4.25	728/1626		4.22		4.06	
y. now would jou grade one overall beauting ellecolvenes		Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	·	_	1123	,20,1020	1.10			1.00	1.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.86	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	525/1549	4.73	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91			4.63	4.32	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1323	4.91	4.03	4.00	3.99	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	608/1384	4.58	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.94	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 904	4.64	4.27	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background informatio	n 17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
Fra	quency	, Die	trib	u+ i o	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 372 8620 University of Maryland Page 1542 Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSA
Enrollment: 11 Spring 2008

Enrollment:	11		
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Quest:	ionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	518/1670	4.59	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	254/1406	4.77	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	238/1615	4.68	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	589/1566	4.24	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	229/1650	4.54	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.55	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626	4.48	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.70
Taskuus														
Lecture	0	0	^	0	0	_	0	4 00	410/1550	1 00	4 60	1 10	4 40	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	∠ 1	10	4.82	419/1559		4.68	4.46	4.40 4.67	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	-	0	0	1	T	10 10	4.91 4.82	596/1560 284/1549	4.91 4.73	4.81 4.64	4.72 4.31		4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	U T	0	10	4.82	284/1549		4.64	4.31	4.25 4.24	4.82 4.91
-	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	119/1323		4.03	4.32	3.99	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	Т	10	4.91	119/1323	4.91	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	215/1384	4.58	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.94	4.65	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	190/ 904	4.64	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.64
Frequ	onarr	Dia+	- n i h	1+101	2									
rrequ	ency	DISU	LIDU	ıcıoı	.1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOWK 387 0101 University of Maryland Title POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1543

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DEMIDENKO, MICH

Enrollment: 31 Ouestionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 0 0 3 23 4.88 224/1670 4.88 4.41 4.31 4.24 4.88 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4 0 0 0 5 21 4.81 259/1666 4.81 4.58 4.27 4.18 4.81 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 0 0 0 1 4 21 4.77 306/1406 4.77 4.61 4.32 4.22 4.77 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 1 0 0 2 5 18 4.64 401/1615 4.64 4.46 4.24 4.18 4.64 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 2 1 5 17 4.48 409/1566 4.48 4.38 4.07 4.04 4.48 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 5 21 4.81 173/1528 0 0 4.81 4.43 4.12 4.07 4.81 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 4 22 4.85 201/1650 4.85 4.65 4.22 4.12 4.85 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 16 10 4.38 1271/1667 4.38 4.63 4.67 4.67 4.38 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 2 0 0 1 7 8 4.44 515/1626 4.44 4.22 4.11 4.06 4.44 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 2 24 4.92 221/1559 4.92 4.68 4.46 4.40 4.92 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 0 26 5.00 1/1560 5.00 4.81 4.72 4.67 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 23 4.88 220/1549 4.88 4.64 4.31 4.25 4.88 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 3 22 4.81 345/1546 4.81 4.63 4.32 4.24 4.81 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 2 0 0 2 5 16 4.61 273/1323 4.61 4.03 4.00 3.99 4.61 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 1 5 17 4.58 384/1384 4.58 4.48 4.10 4.12 4.58 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 3 21 4.88 274/1378 4.88 4.65 4.29 4.30 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 5 19 4.79 396/1378 4.79 4.65 4.31 4.33 4.79 4. Were special techniques successful 6 5 4 0 2 4 9 3.74 638/904 3.74 4.27 4.03 4.03 3.74 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.64 4.53 **** 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.57 4.50 **** 29 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** **** 4.45 3.68 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 80 **** **** 3.97 3.76 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 41 **** 5.00 4.50 4.44 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.19 3.96 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.64 3.33 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.67 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Expected Grades A 10 0 0.00-0.99 0 Required for Majors 4 00-27 Graduate Major 18 1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 5 28-55 1 в 11 C 0 56-83 3 General 4 Under-grad 30 Non-major 12 84-150 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Ρ 0 0 Other 14 Т

Baltimore County

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101

40

HUMAN BEHAVIOR

OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland Page 1544 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies

				LTC	quei	TCTES			TIID	I uccor	-	Course	Debr	UMDC	телет	Secr			
Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1 Pid in in	General	1 6	6.1a. d. m		_	0	0	^	1	_	0.0	4 00	024/1		4 00	4 41	4 21	4 0 4	4 00
1. Did you gain new insi					6	0	0	0 1	1	2	29	4.88	234/1		4.88	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.88
2. Did the instructor mai					6	0	0	_	2	4	25	4.66	428/1		4.66	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.66
3. Did the exam question		_	-		7	0	1	0	7	5	18	4.26	876/1		4.26	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.26
4. Did other evaluations					7	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	368/1		4.68	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.68
5. Did assigned readings					6	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	226/1		4.75	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.75
6. Did written assignmen				rned	6	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	152/1		4.84	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.84
7. Was the grading system			ed		6	0	0	1	4	4	23	4.53	527/1		4.53	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.53
8. How many times was cl					7	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00		L667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the	he overal	l teachi	ng effectiven	ness	12	2	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	207/1	L626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.75
	Lecture																		
1. Were the instructor's	lectures	well pro	epared		8	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	276/1	L559	4.90	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor se					8	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1	L560	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material	presented	and exp	lained clearl	У	8	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	266/1	L549	4.83	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures cont				-	8	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	93/1	L546	4.97	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techn	iques enh	ance you	r understandi	ng	8	7	4	2	6	2	9	3.43	1069/1	L323	3.43	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.43
	-	_																	
	Discuss																		
1. Did class discussions					11	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	215/1		4.81	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.81
2. Were all students act	_	_			11	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	379/1		4.78	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.78
3. Did the instructor en	_		open discussi		11	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	333/1		4.85	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special technique	es succes	sful			11	1	1	1	2	6	16	4.35	322/	904	4.35	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.35
	Laborat	orv																	
2. Were you provided with		-	ound informat	ion	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
	Field W						•		•		_								****
1. Did field experience			_		37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	
2. Did you clearly under	-				37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor ava					37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	
5. Did conferences help	you carry	out fie.	ld activities	5	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	***
			F	reque	ncy	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	dec				Pos	asons					Тълг	26			Majors	
														Тур					
00-27 1 0.0	0-0.99	0	A 19			Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	22
28-55 4 1.0	0-1.99	0	в 10																
56-83 11 2.0	0-2.99	3	C 1			Ger	neral	-				4	Unde	er-gr	rad 3	8	Non-	major	16
84-150 0 3.0	0-3.49	4	D 0																
Grad. 0 3.5	0-4.00	5	F 0			Ele	ectiv	res				1	####	‡ - N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
			P 0										resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
			I 0			Oth	ner				2	3							
			? 0																

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101

HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Title Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1545 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	1060/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	529/1666	4.78	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	483/1406	4.75	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	660/1615	4.53	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	643/1566	4.45	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	406/1528	4.61	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	5		4.57	471/1650	4.76		4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	338/1667	4.78	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	926/1626	4.26	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.06
y. non would fou grade one everall conducting directiveness	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-		-	1.00	320, 2020	1.20	1.22		1.00	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	673/1559	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	17		1023/1560	4.83	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6		4.50	683/1549	4.71	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6		4.52	691/1546	4.63	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	5	0	2	1			1269/1323	3.62	4.03	4.00	3.99	2.50
J. Did addiovibual eccinitydes childhee your anderseanding	1		3	U	2	_	2	2.50	1200/1020	3.02	1.05	1.00	3.77	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	403/1384	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	488/1378	4.79	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	386/1378	4.79	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	0	3	1	1		****/ 904		4.27		4.03	****
1. Were special techniques successivi	J	13	U	U	5			3.00	/ 504	7.72	1.2/	1.03	1.03	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
2. Here you provided with adequate background information	23	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	2.50	, 235			1.21	3.75	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	****
J. Were erreeria for grading made erear	20	2	U	U	U	U	,	3.00	, 00			3.57	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	1	2 33	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
3. Did conterences help you carry out freid activities	21	3	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 31		3.00	4.4/	4.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3 00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	∠.03 ****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
5. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	د ک	_	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	, 0			1.94		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101
Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1545 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Grades Reasons Type					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201 Title

HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1546 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	388/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	121/1666		4.58	4.27	4.18	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	153/1406		4.61	4.32	4.22	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	308/1615		4.46	4.24	4.18	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	242/1566		4.38	4.07	4.04	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60			4.43	4.12	4.07	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1650	4.76	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1256/1667	4.78	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	4.26	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	706/1559	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.83	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	323/1549		4.64	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	631/1546		4.63	4.32	4.24	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	0	0	0	5	3.50	1040/1323	3.62	4.03	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	0	12	4.43	519/1384		4.48	4.10	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	368/1378		4.65	4.29	4.30	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	608/1378		4.65	4.31	4.33	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	243/ 904	4.42	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79		****	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	***	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16		****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	***	4.84	****	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1546 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Reasons			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	13					
				?	0							

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: SOWK 389 8620 University of Maryland Page 1547 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: THIEL, MINDY
Enrollment: 23 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

Questionnaires: 21

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5		Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	1	1	0	12	4 64	505/1670	4 52	4 41	4 31	4 24	4 64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	0	12		224/1666			4.27		4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	2	10		387/1406		4.61		4.22	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	660/1615		4.46	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	540/1566		4.38	4.07	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	10		277/1528			4.12	4.07	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0		12		194/1650			4.22	4.12	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0		14		1/1667		4.63		4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	7	5		547/1626				4.06	4.42
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1559	4.77	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	725/1560	4.83	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.71	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	370/1546	4.63	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	141/1323	3.62	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.85
Planada														
Discussion	0	0	0	0	^	_	11	4 05	000/1204	1 (1	4 40	4 10	4 10	4 05
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0		11		,				4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	-	0	0			13	4.92	194/1378 1/1378			4.29	4.30	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0 3	0	13 7		,			4.31	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	U	U	U	3	2	/	4.33	328/ 904	4.42	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.33
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101 University of Maryland Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT Baltimore County Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO (Instr. A) Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Instructor:	ROHRBACH,	ALISO	(Instr.	Α)
Enrollment:	3			

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1548

AUG 6, 2008

3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.38	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.43	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.65	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.22	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.65	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.27	4.03	4.03	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.44	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	3.96	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.68	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.51	5.00

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101 University of Maryland PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT

Page 1549 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. B)

		,			
Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	3		Student Cours	e Evaluatio	n Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	0	0	-	0	_	_	4 00	1016/1680	4 00	4 41	4 21	4 0 4	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ι	0	0	2		1216/1670		4.41	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.38	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1		1447/1528	3.00	4.43	4.12	4.07	3.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.65	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.63	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.68	4.46	4.40	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1		1189/1378	3.50	4.65	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904		4.27	4.03	4.03	5.00
	_	_		-	•	-	_		_, _,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.44	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	3.96	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.68	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.38	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.51	5.00
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	า									

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

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1550

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	665/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	216/1666	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	4.56	4.61	4.32	4.22	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	706/1566	4.36	4.38	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	346/1528	4.65	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	570/1650	4.52	4.65	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.41	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	693/1626	4.09	4.22	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	871/1559	4.53	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560		4.81	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	323/1549	4.61	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	370/1546	4.66	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1323	3.97	4.03	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	340/1384	4.73	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	637/1378		4.65	4.29	4.30	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	640/1378	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	629/ 904	4.24	4.27	4.03	4.03	3.75

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0301

SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Title Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1551 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncie				tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Se
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4 		Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	M∈
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	1	3	13	4.25	996/1670	4.52	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	622/1666	4.74	4.58	4.27	4.18	4.
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	751/1406	4.56	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	687/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.18	4
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	2	14	4.40	491/1566		4.38	4.07	4.04	4
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4		4.55	383/1528	4.65	4.43	4.12	4.07	4
Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	0	7			903/1650		4.65	4.22	4.12	4
How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	9	9			1652/1667		4.63	4.67	4.67	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1191/1626	4.09	4.22	4.11	4.06	3
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	7	10		1157/1559	4.53	4.68	4.46	4.40	4
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	3	14		1294/1560	4.79	4.81	4.72	4.67	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	977/1549		4.64	4.31	4.25	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32			4.63	4.32	4.24	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	2	5	3	3	3.20	1143/1323	3.97	4.03	4.00	3.99	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	308/1384	4.73	4.48	4.10	4.12	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	400/1378	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.30	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	511/1378	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.33	
Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	194/ 904	4.24	4.27	4.03	4.03	
Laboratory														
Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	•
Seminar														
Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	3.68	
Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	
Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	
Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	,
Self Paced														
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	,
Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	,
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	,
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	***	4.84	****	,
Frequ	encs	. Diet	trib	ıt i o	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 15

I ? Course-Section: SOWK 397 8620

1. SOME 397 6020

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1552 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Qu	uestionnaire
------------------------------	--------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	
General	-	0	•	•	0	_	1.0	4 00	200/1650	4 50	4 47	4 21	4 0 4	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1 1	0	0	0	0	2	12 13	4.80 4.87	300/1670	4.52 4.74	4.41 4.58	4.31	4.24 4.18	4.80 4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.87	207/1666 318/1406	4.74	4.58	4.27 4.32	4.18	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	308/1615	4.56	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.73	429/1566	4.36	4.40	4.24	4.10	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	173/1528	4.65	4.43	4.12	4.04	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	229/1650	4.52	4.65	4.12	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	749/1667	4.41	4.63	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	843/1626		4.22	4.11	4.06	4.15
7. now would you grade the overall teaching critectiveness	3	U	Ü	O	2	,	-	1.13	013/1020	1.00	1.22	1.11	1.00	1.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	435/1559	4.53	4.68	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.79	4.81	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	294/1549	4.61	4.64	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546		4.63	4.32	4.24	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	194/1323	3.97	4.03	4.00	3.99	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1384	4.73	4.48	4.10	4.12	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1378	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	225/1378	4.72	4.65	4.31	4.33	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	317/ 904			4.03		4.36
									,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.76	***
Calf David														
Self Paced	1 -	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	++++/ 00	++++	****	1 (1	2 22	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 28 ****/ 16	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15 15	0	0	0	0	0	0 1		****/ 16 ****/ 27	****	****	4.67 4.54	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10	****	****	4.54	∠.63 ****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 6	****	****	4.84	****	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/			4.24		
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
			I	0	Other	11					
				2	0						

Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH WIECHELT, SHELL

Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1553 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions										Mean			Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1105/1670	4.16	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	895/1666	4.32	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	691/1406	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.48	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	621/1566	4.28	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	5	0	11	4.38	590/1528	4.38	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	,	4.67	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	,		4.63	4.67	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	3	8	2	3.71	1282/1626	3.71	4.22	4.11	4.28	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	15		555/1559			4.46	4.58	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13		1126/1560	4.63	4.81	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	1	3	11		1104/1549	4.11	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	7	9		1121/1546		4.63	4.32	4.43	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	612/1323	4.17	4.03	4.00	4.10	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	690/1384	4.22	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.65	4.29	4.55	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	942/1378	4.11	4.65	4.31	4.60	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	648/ 904		4.27	4.03	4.22	3.71
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	***	3.97	3.67	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
			I	0	Other	15					
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0101 University of Maryland Page 1554 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 SOCIAL WORK METHODS II Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	505/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	210/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	851/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	623/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	352/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	185/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1323	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	10		1/1378		4.65	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	10		1/1378		4.65	4.31		5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	2	7		138/ 904					4.78
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
			I	0	Other	12					
				2	Λ						

1. SOME 402 0201

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1555 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	544/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5 5	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	291/1666	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	11	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	308/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	0	2	13	4.47	419/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	95/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667		4.63	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	3	10		199/1626			4.11	4.28	4.77
			-		-	_								
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	435/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	162/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	857/1323	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.10	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	356/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	337/1378	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.55	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	375/1378	4.95		4.31	4.60	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	230/ 904			4.03		4.53
1. Wele special techniques successful	,	-	Ü	J	-	3		1.55	2307 301	1.71	1.27	1.05	1.22	1.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.30	****
Seminar	00	0	0	0	0	٥	1	F 00	****/ 87	****	****	4 65	4 00	****
 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Was the instructor available for individual attention 	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.65 4.64	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22 22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	****	4.54	4.60 4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 80			3.97	3.07	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
0.15														
Self Paced	2.2	^	0	0	0	0	1	г ос	++++/ 00	++++	++++	1 (1	г ос	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	^ ^ ^ *	^^^	4.64	5.00	* * * * *

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 1555 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	6
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
			I	0	Other	17					
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0301 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: TING, LAURA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1556

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	505/1670	4.73	4.41	4.31	4.45	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	250/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	2		****/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	238/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	540/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	162/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	316/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	4.92	4.63	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	403/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	403/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	275/1549	4.86	4.64	4.31	4.43	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	322/1546	4.92	4.63	4.32		4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	634/1323	4.25		4.00	4.10	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.67	324/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0		15		1/1378			4.10	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0		15		1/1378			4.31	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	3	10		230/ 904				4.22	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Fynested Crades				Po:	agone	,			ጥኒክ	20			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	0						

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSA

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 1557 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1670		4.41	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	233/1666	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.35	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1615	4.85	4.46	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.17	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1528	4.89	4.43	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1650	4.88	4.65	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	922/1667		4.63	4.67	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.28	4.89
Taskiiia														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.68	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.81	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1549		4.64	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1546		4.63	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	183/1323		4.03	4.00	4.10	4.75
5. 214 ddd10.124d1 ccomii.4acb cimanoc your andcibedhaing	-	ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	ŭ		11.75	100, 1010	1.25	1.05	1.00	1.10	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.95	4.65	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 904	4.71	4.27	4.03	4.22	5.00
Seminar	1 -	0	0	_	0	1	_	4 00	****/ O7	****	****	4 65	4 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15 15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87 ****/ 79	****	****	4.65 4.64	4.80	****
		0			0	1	0		****/ 79	****	****		4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	-	_	•		,		****	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	U	U	U	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.02	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 31		5.00	4.47	4.49	5.00
		-	-	-	-	-	-		_, 51					
Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						