Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

MORRIS, KATHERI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1461 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Ouestions	MR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	808/1576	4.54	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	392/1576	4.76	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	583/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	487/1520	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	3	10	4.06	824/1465	4.33	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	435/1434	4.60	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	179/1547	4.81	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	13 7	4.72	813/1574		4.78	4.64	4.62	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	U	U	U	3	4	/	4.29	682/1554	4.44	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	278/1488	4.96	4.75	4.47	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	407/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	364/1489	4.84	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	129/1277	4.76	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	445/1279	4.54	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	582/1270	4.70	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	491/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	464/ 878	4.24	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4 44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/ 375	4.97	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 382	4.97	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-	_		
				?	0						

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1462 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

G	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	naire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.54	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	187/1576		4.70	4.30	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342		4.69	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	429/1520	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	483/1465	4.33	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	345/1434		4.58	4.14	4.06	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	280/1547	4.81	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0		12	4.92	375/1574		4.78	4.64	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7		4.30	662/1554			4.10		4.30
J. now would you grade the overall ecaoning effectiveness		Ü	O	0	O	,	5	1.50	002/1331		1.50	1.10	1.05	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1488	4.96	4.75	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0		14		1/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0			4.93	155/1489	4.84	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	181/1277	4.76	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	568/1279	4.54	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	478/1270	4.70	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	511/1269	4.80	4.72	4.35	4.29	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	8				4.32		3.92	
4. Were special techniques successiui	,	۷	U	U	_	2	0	4.04	1/3/ 6/6	4.24	4.32	4.05	3.94	4.04
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 375		4.99	4.01	4.21	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	U	U	U	U	U	U	20	5.00	1/ 3/5	4.97	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 382	4.97	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00
1 Short divagir products for all the statements	J	J	3	3	,	0	_0	2.00	1, 302		2.00	1.00	1.55	3.00
Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Title MORRIS, KATHERI Instructor:

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Page 1463 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

			Fre	miar	cies			Inct	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1576	4.54	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	279/1576	4.76	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1520	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	366/1465	4.33	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	193/1434	4.60	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	110/1547	4.81	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1554		4.38	4.10		4.73
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1488	4.96	4.75	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	297/1489	4.84	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	159/1277	4.76	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1279	4.54	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	326/1270	4.70	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	447/ 878	4.24	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	***	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 85	****	г оо	4 70	4 70	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0		0			0		,	****	4.80	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	-	0	-	0	0	1		****/ 72	****		4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80		****	4.61	4.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	U	0	U	0	1	11	4.92	122/ 375	4.97	4.99	4.01	4.21	4.92
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.71	****
	11	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 45	****				****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1 12	5.00	, -	5.00	4.49	4.57	4.64	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	U	U	U	U	U	U	12	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	1	11		154/ 382	4.97	5.00	4.08	4.39	4.92
J. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	U	U	U	U	U	_		1.22	134/ 302	ユ・ ノ /	3.00	1.00	1.33	1.22

Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO

Instructor:

MORRIS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1463 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other		-		_		
				?	0							

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1464 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions			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	12	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	243/1576	4.51	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	152/1576	4.62	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	209/1342	4.62	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	197/1520	4.48	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	127/1465	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	252/1434	4.48	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	527/1547	4.40	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	10	10		1079/1574	4.63	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	316/1554		4.38	4.10		4.60
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1/	U	U	U	U	O	9	4.00	310/1334	4.10	4.30	4.10	4.05	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1488	4.76	4.75	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	339/1486	4.72	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	251/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	194/1277	4.65	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.70
Diamond on														
Discussion	1.0	0	0	1	1	_	10	4 47	477 /1070	4 4 5	1 60	4 17	1 1 1	4 47
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	477/1279	4.45	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	763/1270	4.43	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	409/1269	4.68	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	193/ 878	4.44	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	***	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	0	0	2.	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/ 375	4.98	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/ 326	4.98	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
5. Did connecences help you carry out freed accrylities	U	U	U	U	U	U	34	5.00	1/ 3/20	4.70	7.77	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	69/ 382	4.98	5.00	4.08	4.39	4.97

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1464 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Title BAFFOUR, TIFFAN

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 28

Enrollment:

28

Baltimore County Spring 2009

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1465

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	988/1576	4.51	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	851/1576	4.62	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	726/1342	4.62	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	945/1520	4.48	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	718/1465	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	670/1434	4.48	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	794/1547	4.40	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.63	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	5	4			1187/1554		4.38	4.10	4.05	
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	846/1488	4.76	4.75	4.47	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	437/1486		4.76	4.32	4.29	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1		12	4.69	474/1489		4.74		4.31	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	258/1277	4.65	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	532/1279	4.45	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	636/1270	4.43	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	602/1269	4.68	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	350/ 878	4.44	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27 27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.80	4.72	4.78	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.69	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	55/ 375	4.98	4.99	4.01	4.21	
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	U	U	U	U	U	_	27	4.90	33/ 3/3	4.90	4.99	4.01	4.21	4.90
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	53/ 326	4.98	4.99	4.03	4.43	4.96
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.63	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 382	4.98	5.00	4.78		5.00
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	U	Τ.	U	U	U	U	۷ /	5.00	1/ 302	4.20	3.00	4.00	4.33	5.00

Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I

Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1465 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	28	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_		-	
				?	1						

INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I

Title Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1466 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	. aain na	General w insights,skills fi	rom this source	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 E0	1 / / E / 1 E 7 6	2 E O	4.56	4.30	4.35	3.50
		w insignts, skills in tor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1445/1576 608/1576	3.50 4.50	4.50	4.30	4.35	4.50
		estions reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.69	4.32		4.00
	_	ations reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.50
		adings contribute to		0	0	0	0	1	1			1242/1465	3.50	4.35	4.12	4.09	3.50
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1204/1434	3.50	4.58	4.14	4.06	3.50
		system clearly exp		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.50
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.38	4.10	4.05	3.50
		Lecture															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures well	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.75	4.47	4.44	4.00
		tor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	1			1210/1493	4.50	4.91	4.73		4.50
		erial presented and		0	0	0	0	0	2			1101/1486	4.00	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.00
		s contribute to what		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.50
		Discussion															
		ssions contribute to		0	0	0	0	1	1			1064/1279	3.50	4.62	4.17	4.14	3.50
		ts actively encourag		0	0	0	0	1	0		4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.00
		tor encourage fair a	and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.81			4.50
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques successful		0	0	0	0	1	0	Τ	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.00
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made clea	ar	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00
		Field Work															
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry out	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
3. Dia coi	II CI CIICCD	neip you carry out	TICIA ACCIVICIO	J	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	17 320	3.00	1.,,,	1.05	1.15	3.00
		Self Paced															
5. Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for all	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00
			Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
							_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduate	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	rad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	D 0								0			1			1-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0 P 0		Εle	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	n
			P 0 I 0		Otl	nor					2	response	es to E	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
			? 0		ULI	ICI					4						
			: 0														

Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1467 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran		Course	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		General			_	0	0	1	1	2	26	4 00	242/1	F76	4 02	1 56	4 20	4 20	4 00
		insights,skil or make clear			5 5	0	0	1	1	3 4	36 34	4.80	243/1 279/1		4.83 4.85	4.56 4.70	4.30	4.30	4.80 4.76
						0	0	0	0	3									
		stions reflect			5	0	0	1	1	2	38 36	4.93	143/1		4.91	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.93 4.82
		ions reflect			6	0	0	1	4	5	31	4.82	185/1		4.81	4.59			4.82
	_	lings contribu		-	5	0	0	1	1		33		304/1		4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	
				at you learned	5 5	0	0	T	2	6 4		4.73	209/1		4.79	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.73
		ystem clearly	-		5 7	-	0	0	0		35	4.80	186/1		4.82	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.80
		s class cance				0 1	1	0	1	14 4	25	4.64	942/1		4.82	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.64
9. HOW WO	uid you gra	ide the overal	ii teaching	effectiveness	16	Τ	Τ	U	Τ	4	23	4.66	272/1	554	4.69	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.66
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	he instruct	or's lectures	s well prepa	ared	7	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1	488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the	e instructo	r seem intere	ested in the	subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	167/1	493	4.99	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.97
3. Was le	cture mater	rial presented	d and expla:	ned clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	137/1	486	4.91	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.92
4. Did the	e lectures	contribute to	what you	learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	33	4.85	263/1	489	4.87	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.85
		echniques enh			9	0	0	2	1	3	31	4.70	187/1	277	4.52	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.70
1 Did al	ace diegnes	Discuss ions contribu		vou learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	184/1	270	4.91	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.88
		actively end			14	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00		270	4.89	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00
		or encourage f	_		14	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	342/1		4.84	4.81	4.35	4.41	
		niques succes	_	en discussion	16	3	1	0	8	1	17	4.22	383/		4.58	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.22
,	F	-				-	_	-		_									
1		Seminar		2 . 1	4.5	•	0	0	•	0		F 00	ale ale ale ale /	0.5	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 50	4 68	de de de de
		oics relevant			45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
		or available f			45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	
		jects contribu			45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
		contribute t		learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were c	riteria for	grading made	e clear		0	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/	375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
		Field V	Vork																
5. Did co	nferences h	nelp you carry	y out field	activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/	326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self I	Do god																
5. Were t	here enough	n proctors for		tudents	1	0	0	0	0	0	45	5.00	1/	382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
		- F			_		-	-	-				-,						
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	E	spected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 A 14			~					0				0	Mo do		30		
00-27 28-55	2	A 14 B 15		Kec	4ulr(ed fo	שויו דר ואופ	Jor	ö	U	Grad	udle	=	U	Majo) L	30		
56-83	11	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Unde	r-ar	rad 4	6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	2	D 0												-		5			
Grad.	0	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				0	####	: - N	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh		
	-	3.50-4.00	P 0								-			es to b			_	, -	
		I O		Oth	ner				2	8						-			
				? 0															

Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I

Questions

PLANELL, JOAN Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1468 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

			 1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	Λ	1	1	18	4.85	203/1576	4.83	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.85
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	91/1576	4.85	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.95
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89			4.69	4.32	4.30	4.89
		ations reflect			1	0	0	1	0		17	4.79			4.59	4.25	4.25	4.79
				what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	15	4.47	410/1465		4.35	4.12	4.09	4.47
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1		17			4.79	4.58		4.15	4.84
		signments contr. s system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	1	1	17		160/1547	4.82	4.68	4.19	4.13	
		was class cance		iiiled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574		4.78	4.64	4.61	
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.72			4.38	4.10		4.72
3. 110W WO	ara you s	rade elle overd	rr ccac	ining circotiveness	-	J	Ü	Ü	-	5		1.72	213/1331	1.05	1.50	1.10	1.05	1.72
		Lecture		,			•	_		•			222/1/22					
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	339/1488		4.75	4.47	4.47	
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	4.99	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1		18	4.89			4.76			
		es contribute to		-	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	205/1489					
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	4	2	0	1	0	12	4.33	463/1277	4.52	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.33
		Discus	zion															
1 Did al:	ace diecu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	101/1279	4 91	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.95
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	_	16	4.79	378/1270		4.72	4.35		4.79
		_	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1		17	4.79	342/1269		4.72	4.35		4.84
		_		d open discussion	1	4	0	0	0			4.93						
4. were s	рестат се	echniques succes	SSLUI		1	4	U	U	U	1	14	4.93	81/ 878	4.58	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.93
		Labora	-															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
		Field V	Mork															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
J. 214 00.	01 011000	noip you our.	, 000 1	1014 4001710105	_	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü		3.00	1, 320	3.00	2.,,,	1.05	1123	3.00
		Self 1																
5. Were th	here enou	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	ason	g			Тур	ne.			Majors	=
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduate	2	0	Majo	or	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 1	В 7		_		,				•		, .				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-gr	rad 2	20	Non-	major	4	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 9	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - M				_	gh	
				P 0								_	response	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her				1	.8						
				? 0														

Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR

Instructor: HARRIS, JESSE

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24

CIAL WORK & HLTH CAR Baltimore County
RRIS, JESSE Spring 2009
5

Page 1469 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

							Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		General	 1															
1 Did s	vou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	8	0	0	3	2	3	8	4 00	1148/1576	4.28	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.00
		tor make clear			8	0	1	0	4	2	9		1058/1576	4.28	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.13
		estions reflect			9	0	0	1	0	4	10		552/1342	4.49	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.53
		ations reflect			8	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1012/1520	4.03	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.06
5. Did a	assigned re	adings contribu	ıte to i	what you learned	9	0	1	1	6	2	5	3.60	1208/1465	3.80	4.35	4.12	4.09	3.60
6. Did v	written ass	ignments contri	ibute to	o what you learned	9	6	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	360/1434	4.34	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.56
7. Was t	the grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	9	0	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1247/1547	4.18	4.68	4.19	4.21	3.73
8. How r	many times	was class cance	elled		9	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1405/1574	4.57	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.13
9. How v	would you g	rade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	15	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.06	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.11
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lectures		orepared	11	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1233/1488	4.31	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.00
		tor seem intere			10	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	4.94	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
				xplained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	871/1486	4.68	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.36
4. Did t	the lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	10	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	867/1489	4.57	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.36
5. Did a	audiovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	10	6	2	1	0	0	5	3.63	963/1277	4.15	4.43	4.03	4.11	3.63
			_															
1 544.		Discus			1 2	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	774/1070	4 40	4 60	4 17	4.20	4.09
				what you learned d to participate	13 13	0	0	2	1 2	2		4.09	774/1279 686/1270	4.42 4.54	4.62 4.72	4.17 4.35	4.42	4.45
				d open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2		4.64		4.69	4.81	4.35	4.41	
		chniques succes		a open discussion	13	5	0	0	2	0		4.33					4.09	
	-	-																
F 17		Semina			0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	F 00	1 / 275	F 00	4 00	4 01	4 10	F 00
5. were	criteria i	or grading made	e crear		U	0	0	0	0	U	24	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
		Field V	Work															
5. Did (conferences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were	there enou	igh proctors for		he students	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 A 7				ed fo	 or Ma	 aior		1	Graduat		0	Majo		7	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 0	B 4		rec	1UTT (cu I	J⊥ 1*1¢	בטנ ג	D	_	Graduati	_	J	ria JC	, <u>.</u>	,
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	17
84-150		D 0								-					5	= :		
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
			P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0		Otł	ner					3						
				? 0														

Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR

Instructor: ROCKWOOD, JANE

Enrollment:

12 Questionnaires: 9 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1470 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.28	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	698/1576	4.28	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44		4.49	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4		1041/1520	4.03	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	_	4.00	850/1465	3.80	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	816/1434	4.34	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	387/1547	4.18	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	4.57	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.06	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	722/1488	4.31	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.94	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	4.68	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	350/1489	4.57			4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	215/1277	4.15	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0		4.75	262/1279	4.42	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.63		4.54	4.72	4.35		4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	444/1269	4.69		4.35	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 878	4.24	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.14
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7														
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		кес	4ulre	eu I	or Ma	Jors	j.	1	Graduate	E	0	Majo	T.	5
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 1 C 0		Ger	nera:	1				5	Under-gr	rad	9	Non-	major	4
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0$		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
P 0								2	response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

2

0

1

?

Title POL/PROG/SERV: CHILDREN

Instructor: DEMIDENKO, MICH

Enrollment: 30 Spring 2009

Page 1471 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u qain ne	ew insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	163/1576	4.90	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.90
		tor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	152/1576	4.90	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.90
		estions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	90/1342	4.95	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.95
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	138/1520	4.90	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.90
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.71
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	110/1434	4.90	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.90
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.68	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How max	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1398/1574	4.14	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.14
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	307/1554	4.62	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.62
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures well		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00
		ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
		erial presented and		0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	172/1486	4.90	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.90
		es contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	97/1489	4.95	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.95
5. Did au	rid audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.67
		Discussion															
		ssions contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.90
		nts actively encourag		0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	130/1270	4.95	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.95
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques successful		0	2	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	197/ 878	4.58	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.58
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made clear	r	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
_	_	Self Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for all	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	 A 18		Re:	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 :s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	В 1			-10-1)	-	-	or addac.	-	-			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		Ge	nera	1			1	.0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0							_	-					5 2	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
			P 0									respons					
			I 0		Ot:	her					9	_		3			
			? 0														
			? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU Enrollment:

Title

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101

HUMAN BEHAVIOR

40 Ouestionnaires: 39

Page 1472 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	39	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
		Frequencies
	Ouestions	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 1

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		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	9	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	595/1576	4.53	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	364/1576	4.69	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	500/1342	4.59	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	5	4	20	4.43	631/1520	4.43	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	468/1465	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	375/1547	4.63	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.78	4.64		4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	0	16		4.33	623/1554		4.38			4.33
,,		_	-	-	-		-		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	12	17	4.53	834/1488	4.53	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	4	8		4.47	735/1486	4.47	4.76		4.32	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.74	4.32		4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	16	2	1	3	1	6	3.62	968/1277	3.62	4.43	4.03		3.62
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	10	10	2	_	5		U	3.02	500/12//	3.02	1.13	1.03	7.11	3.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	696/1270	4.45	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	21	6	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	631/ 878	3.75		4.05		3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	21	0	Τ	U	4	3	4	3.75	031/ 0/0	3.75	4.32	4.05	4.09	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 379	****	****	4.29	4.17	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3 /	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	/ 3/9			4.20	4.1/	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.33	****
-	1	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01		5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	U	U	U	U	U	30	5.00	1/ 3/3	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	2 67	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	1 27	****
-		0	1 0	0	0		2		, -	****			4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37					0	_	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 44	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		/	****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 45		4.49	4.57	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
Colf Darad														
Self Paced	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	++++/ 40	****	****	4 60	4 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40			4.60	4.83	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00

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

40

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1472 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				?	1						

HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Title Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1473 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	952/1576	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.25
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	798/1576	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.38
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	455/1342	4.84	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.63
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	792/1520	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.31
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	537/1465	4.49	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.38
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	305/1434	4.70	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.63
	Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44		4.73	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.44
	How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94		4.73	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.94
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	7	0	3.54	1292/1554	4.24	4.38	4.10	4.09	3.54
	. 3														
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.87	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.75
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1029/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.69
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	530/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.63
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	696/1489	4.68	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.50
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	692/1277	4.45	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.00
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	3	1	3	7	3.80	938/1279	4.47	4.62	4.17	4.20	3.80
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.80	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.73
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	467/1269	4.91	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.73
4.	Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	538/ 878	4.10	4.32	4.05	4.09	3.92
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
	Field Work				_	_									
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	4.49	4.57	4.50	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
	0.16 7.1														
1	Self Paced	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	1 60	4 02	****
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 40 ****/ 24	****	****	4.60 4.83	4.83	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 24 ****/ 28	****	****	4.83	4.89 5.00	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.24	5.00
Э.	mere chere enough procedus for all the scudents	U	U	U	U	U	U	44	5.00	1/ 302	5.00	5.00	4.00	7.24	5.00

Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1473 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				?	0						

Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

OSES, JAMAAL Spring 2009 25 Page 1474 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	324/1576	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1576	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1342	4.84	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	357/1520	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	513/1465	4.49	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	d 10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	209/1434	4.70	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	86/1547	4.73	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	11	4		1317/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 16	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.24	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	614/1489	4.68	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		10	0	0	1	0	3		****/1277	4.45	4.43	4.03	4.11	****
5. Dia addiovidual econniques cimanee your anaciseanaing		10	J	Ü	_	J	3	1.50	, 12, ,	1.15	1.15	1.05		
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	373/1279	4.47	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	208/1270	4.80	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1269	4.91	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	580/ 878	4.10	4.32	4.05	4.09	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	n 24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
		_	_	-		_	_		,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
									, -					
Self Paced	2.1	_	_	•	_	_	_	F 0.5			ato at 1 t	4	4 00	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR

HUMAN BEHAVIOR II ctor: MOSES, JAMAAL

Instructor: MOSE Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1474 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II

Instructor: THIEL, MINDY

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1475 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			0	_		MD	377		_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
			Question	S 		NR 	NA 	1 	2 	3 	4 . – – –	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	1															
			w insights,ski			1	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	347/1576	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.71
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	215/1576	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.82
			estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0			4.95	90/1342	4.84	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.95
			ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	-	17	4.73	281/1520	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.73
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	2		17	4.68	251/1465	4.49	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.68
					o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1		17		218/1434	4.70	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.73
			system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	1			4.82	179/1547	4.73	4.68	4.19	4.21	
			was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574			4.64	4.61	5.00
9. 1	How wou	ild you g	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	208/1554	4.24	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.74
			Lectur	e															
1. 1	Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1488	4.87	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. 1	Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. 1	Was lec	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00
4.	Did the	lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	97/1489	4.68	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.95
5.	Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	105/1277	4.45	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.90
			Discus	aion															
1 1	Did cla	ee diecu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1279	4.47	4 62	4.17	4.20	5.00
					d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	412/1270	4.80		4.35	4.42	4.75
					d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269	4.91	4.81		4.41	
			chniques succe		d open arseassion	1	2	0	0	3	3		4.53	214/ 878	4.10	4.32		4.09	
						_	_	_	-	-	-			,					
_			Semina	_															
5.	Were cr	iteria f	or grading mad	e clear	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
			Field	Work															
5. 1	Did con	ferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
			Self	Dagod															
5. 1	Were th	ere enou	gh proctors fo		he students	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
			-																
					Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Cre	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00	 -27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	r	19
28	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			_			_						3 -		
56	-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	3
84	-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									_				-	
Gra	ad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Oth	ner				1	9						
					? 0														

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

Page 1476 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	General ew insights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	301/1576	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.75
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00
		estions reflect the e		0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.30	5.00
		ations reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.66	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.75
	_	eadings contribute to	-	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465		4.35	4.12	4.09	4.50
		signments contribute t g system clearly expla		0	0	0	0	0	2 1	2	4.50 4.75	398/1434 238/1547		4.58 4.68	$4.14 \\ 4.19$	4.15 4.21	4.50 4.75
		was class cancelled	arnea	0	0	0	0	0	0	3 4	5.00	1/1574		4.08	4.19	4.21	5.00
		grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554		4.38	4.10		4.50
		Lecture															
		actor's lectures well		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00
		ctor seem interested i		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493		4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
		terial presented and e		2	0 0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.74	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did au	ldiovisual	our understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.11	5.00	
1 Did al	agg diggs	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.62	4.17	4.20	5.00	
		ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00	
		ctor encourage fair ar		3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269				4.41	
F M		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	F 00	1 / 255	F 00	4 00	4 01	4 10	F 00	
5. were c	riteria i	for grading made clear	2	0	U	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
5. Did co	nferences	Field Work s help you carry out f	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00		
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	1		
00-27	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		1		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0								•						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
			P 0 I 0		∩ +1	her					1	respons	es to £	e sign	ırıcan	l L	
			? 0		ULI	ner					т						

PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT

Title Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1477 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	=															
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.80		4.30	4.30	4.86
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00
	_	estions reflect		_	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.30	5.00
		ations reflect	_	_	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	429/1520	4.66	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.57
	_	_		hat you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	4.75	4.35	4.12	4.09	5.00
		_		what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	498/1434	4.46		4.14	4.15	4.43
		system clearly	-	nea	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	6	5.00	1/1547	4.88		4.19	4.21	5.00
	-	was class cance			2	1	0	0	1	2	-	4.86	567/1574	4.93	4.78	4.64 4.10	4.61	4.86
9. HOW WOI	iia you g	rade the overal	li teacn	ing effectiveness	2	1	U	U	1	2	Τ	4.00	924/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.00
		Lecture	_															
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.83
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
		_		plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1486	5.00		4.32	4.32	5.00
		s contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489	5.00		4.32	4.34	
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.11	5.00
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.62	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were a	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa							0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss							0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te		2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.32	4.05	4.09	5.00		
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequat	e backg	round information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	***
		Semina																
5. Were ci	riteria f	or grading made			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
4 -11 61		Field V			_		_	•	•	•						4 40	4 0.5	****
		ience contribut			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****
		understand you			6 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48		4.67	4.40	3.92	
5. Dia coi	nierences	help you carry	out ii	eid activities	U	U	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self I																
5. Were th	nere enoug	gh proctors for	all th	e students	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1												
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	=			Туј	ne.			Majors	
										, 								
00-27 28-55	0 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 7 B 0		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Cor	nera	1				7	IIndox a	~~ d	7	Mon	mo i o m	7
56-83 84-150	1	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ger	uera.	L				,	Under-g	Lau	1	MO11-	major	/
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	D 0 F 0		רם.	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	P 0		Elt	ECLI	/ CD				U	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	her					1	T Capons	-5 CO L	C DIGII	call		
				? 0		0.01						•						

SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Title

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1478 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	882/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	811/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	17	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	597/1520	4.68	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	6	9	3.91	989/1465	4.23	4.35	4.12	4.09	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	398/1434	4.66	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	690/1547	4.67	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1025/1574	4.84	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	692/1554	4.54	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	7	12		1025/1488	4.71	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.89	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	911/1486	4.62	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	350/1489	4.78	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	15	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1277	4.37	4.43	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	413/1279	4.64	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	307/1270	4.78		4.17	4.42	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	511/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	2	0	6	9	4.29	344/ 878	4.49	4.32			4.29
1. Note special deciminates successful		_	O	_	Ü	Ü		1.27	311/ 0/0	1.17	1.52	1.05	1.05	1.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****
 Did field experience contribute to what you learned Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 	28 28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75		3.92	****
	28	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 44	****		4.40		****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.90 4.49	4.73 4.57	4.63 4.50	****
 To what degree could you discuss your evaluations Did conferences help you carry out field activities 	28 0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.49	4.57	4.23	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	U	U	U	U	U	U	29	5.00	1/ 320	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1478 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Title JANI, JAYSHREE

Instructor:

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1479 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies								Inst	ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	359/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	392/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	161/1520	4.68	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	647/1465	4.23	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	323/1434	4.66	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	173/1547	4.67	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1574	4.84	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	355/1554	4.54	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	309/1488	4.71	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	868/1493	4.89	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	484/1486	4.62	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	420/1489	4.78	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	3	0	0	6	13	4.18	593/1277	4.37	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	373/1279	4.64	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	401/1270	4.78	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	278/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	283/ 878	4.49	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08		5.00
Frace		- D:-	d la.		_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				2	1						

SOCIAL WORK METHODS I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 23

Baltimore County Spring 2009 MORRIS, KATHERI

Page 1480 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	
Queberonnaires.	10	beadene courbe Evaluation gatheronnaire	

Questions					NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights, skil	ls from	this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	277/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.78
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	256/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.78
3. Did t	he exam qı	uestions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	281/1520	4.68	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.72
		eadings contribut			1	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	353/1465		4.35	4.12	4.09	4.53
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	122/1434		4.58	4.14	4.15	4.88
	-	g system clearly	_	ied	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	228/1547		4.68	4.19	4.21	4.76
		was class cance		66	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	- , -		4.78	4.64	4.61	4.94
9. How w	ould you g	grade the overal.	1 teachi	ng effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	173/1554	4.54	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.79
	Lecture																	
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	278/1488	4.71	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.89
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493		4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	16	4.89	191/1486		4.76	4.32	4.32	4.89
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	274/1489		4.74	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enha	ance you	r understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	283/1277	4.37	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.56
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contribu	te to wh	at you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	262/1279	4.64	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.75
		nts actively enc			3	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	435/1270	4.78	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.73
		ctor encourage fa		open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	409/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.79
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	sful		3	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	133/ 878	4.49	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.79
		Seminar																
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	clear		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00
		Field Wo	ork															
5. Did c	onferences	s help you carry	out fie	eld activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self Pa	aced															
5. Were	there enou	agh proctors for		students	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	ona	. Dia	+rih	+	n									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	`s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			-			_						3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	4
84-150																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
	P 0						her						respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
			I O								1	4						
				3 0														

University of Maryland

Course-Section: SOWK 470 0101 Title

SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

WIECHELT, SHELL Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1481 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions						NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 154	l rron goin m	Genera new insights,ski	_	om this source	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.60
		iew insignes,ski ictor make clear			4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.60
		questions reflec			4	0	0	0	1	4		4.70	369/1342		4.69	4.32	4.46	4.70
		luations reflect			4	0	0	0	2			4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.60
				what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.30
				to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.58	4.14	4.30	4.60
		ng system clearl			5	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	445/1547	4.58	4.68	4.19		4.58
		s was class canc		ariica	4	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574		4.78	4.64		4.95
				ching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	672/1554		4.38	4.10		
	Lecture																	
1. Wer	e the insti	ructor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.91	4.73	4.80	4.75
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	3	17	4.85	221/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.85
		res contribute t			4	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	637/1489	4.55	4.74	4.32	4.38	4.55
				your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	123/1277	4.83	4.43	4.03	4.04	4.83
		Discus	gion															
1 Did	l class disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	350/1279	4.65	4.62	4.17	4 31	4.65
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	620/1270	4.53	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.53
				nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	596/1269	4.59	4.81	4.35		4.59
		techniques succe		ia open arroadron	7	2	3	0	2	2	8	3.80	603/ 878		4.32	4.05		
		Semina	r															
5. Wer	e criteria	for grading mad	e clear	r	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did	l conference	es help you carr	y out :	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.97	5.00
		Self																
5. Wer	e there end	ough proctors fo	r all	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00
Frequ							trib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						quir	ed f	or Ma	 ijor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	18
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						-			-						3 -		
56-83	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 2					Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	6
84-15	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
I 0					Ot1	her				1	.2							
				? 0														

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1482 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General																
1 Di	d vou	gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	219/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.83
			tor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.83
			estions reflect			4	8	0	0	0	1		4.75	298/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.75
		_	ations reflect		_	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.83
				-	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	316/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.58
		_	-		what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1434		4.58	4.14	4.30	5.00
			system clearly		_	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1547		4.68	4.19	4.24	5.00
			was class cance			4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574		4.78	4.64		4.92
	_				ning effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.83
	Lecture																		
1. We	ere the	instru	ctor's lectures	well r	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.92
2. Di	ld the	instruc	tor seem intere	sted in	n the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Wa	as lect	ure mat	erial presented	l and ex	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.92
4. Di	ld the	lecture	s contribute to	what y	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Di	ld audi	ovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	our understanding	4	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	3.50
			Discuss	ion															
1. Di	d clas	s discu	ssions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.91
2. We	ere all	studen	ts actively end	ourage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	345/1270	4.88	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.82
3. Di	d the	instruc	tor encourage f	air and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.94	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.91
4. We	ere spe	cial te	chniques succes	sful		5	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	175/ 878	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	4.64
			Seminar																
5. We	ere cri	teria f	or grading made	clear		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00
			Field W	lork															
1. Di	ld fiel	d exper	ience contribut	e to wh	nat you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	***
2. Di	ld you	clearly	understand you	ır evalı	uation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	****
3. Wa	as the	instruc	tor available f	or cons	sultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.60	****
4. To	what	degree	could you discu	ıss your	r evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.57	4.34	***
5. Di	ld conf	erences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 326	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	5.00
			Self P			0													
5. We	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students						0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00
Freq							Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	;
00-2	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5						Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	11
28-5	55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			-			-						3 -		
56-8	33	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	5
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																-			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Electives							0	#### - Means there are not enough			ŗh			
P 0					22002100								responses to be significant						

Other

I

0

10

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1483 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								Ingtructor									
	Ouestions			MID	3.77	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	_	Inst Mean	tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions		NR 	NA 						Mean	Rank 	mean	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skills	from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	179/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.88
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear th	e expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	91/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.94
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect t	he expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	5.00
		uations reflect th		2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	149/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.88
		_	e to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	290/1465		4.35	4.12	4.22	4.63
			ite to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1434		4.58	4.14	4.30	5.00
	_	g system clearly e	-	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82				4.19	4.24	4.82
	-	was class cancell		2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574		4.78	4.64	4.69	4.94
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	124/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.88
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.94
		ctor seem interest		2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493		4.91	4.73	4.80	5.00
			and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1486		4.76	4.32	4.41	4.94
		es contribute to w		2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1489		4.74	4.32	4.38	5.00
			ce your understanding	2	3	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	869/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	3.79
		7.															
1 Did al	acc dica	Discussio	n : to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.93
			raged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1270		4.72	4.35	4.53	5.00
		_	r and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269		4.81	4.35	4.55	5.00
		echniques successf	_	4	1	0	0	1	1	12		133/ 878				4.33	
		-															
1 1/10		Seminar	the surrounced thems	1 /	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.77	F 00
			the announced theme individual attention	14 14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	1/ 85 43/ 79		4.80	4.72	4.77	5.00 4.80
			to what you learned	14	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72		****	4.64	4.64	****
		ons contribute to		15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80		****	4.61	4.52	****
_		for grading made c	-	0	1	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	138/ 375		4.99		3.90	
1 511 61		Field Wor		1.0	0	0	•	0	0	0	F 00	1 / 50	4 55	4 55	4 40	4 50	F 00
	_		to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 52		4.75	4.48	4.70	5.00
_			evaluation criteria	11 11	0 1	0	0	0	0	8 7	5.00	1/ 48		4.67	4.40	4.30	5.00
		ctor available for could you discuss		12	0	0	0	0	3	4	5.00 4.57	1/ 44 26/ 45		4.90 4.49	4.73 4.57	4.60 4.34	5.00 4.57
	_	_	out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	17		79/ 326			4.03		
J. DIG 00	01 01100	s neip you cally o		_	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	_			,,, 520	1.,,	1.,,,	1.05	3.37	
		Self Pac							•		- 00	4 4 000		- 00	4 00		
5. Were t	nere eno	ugh proctors for a	III the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Τv	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 8-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2				Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	13
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0				Co	noro.	1				0	Under-9	rad 1	L9	Mon	-major	6
	56-83				General						J	onder-9	ıau .	L 2	MOI1-	ilia JUL	O
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	= *	Electives							0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
J_ 44.	•	3.33 1.00 /	P 0	Electives				U			respons				_	,	
			I 0		Other				16			10050110		91			
I 0 Othe						Other											

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: TING, LAURA

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

3

University of Maryland Page 1484
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions					NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 ı															
1 Did vo	u dain new	insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.67
-	_	or make clear			1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.83
		stions reflect			1	9	0	0	0	1	2		****/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	****
		tions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	665/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.42
			_	at you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	571/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.33
				what you learned		1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	296/1434	4.78	4.58	4.14	4.30	4.64
		system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	110/1547	4.78	4.68	4.19	4.24	4.92
		as class cance		.eu	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	758/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.75
	_			ng effectivenes	_	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.67
9. HOW WO	uiu you gi	ade the overal	ii teaciii	ing effectivenes	5 3		U	U	U	3	0	4.07	203/1354	4.70	4.30	4.10	4.24	4.07
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.92
2. Did th	e instruct	or seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	4.92
3. Was le	cture mate	rial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	339/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.75
4. Did th	e lectures	contribute to	what yo	u learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	500/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	1	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	791/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	3.92
		Discuss																
1 544 -1				at you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	014/1070	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4 00
				to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	214/1279 345/1270	4.88	4.72	4.17	4.53	4.82 4.82
		_	_	open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.82	,	4.88	4.72	4.35	4.55	4.82
		_		open discussion	2	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	187/ 878	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	4.60
4. were s	pecial tec	hniques succes	SSLUI		۷	Τ	U	Τ	U	1	8	4.60	18// 8/8	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	4.60
		Semina	<u>-</u>															
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00
		Field V	Jork															
1 Did fi	eld evneri			t you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	37/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	4.50
		understand you			7	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	33/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	4.33
_	_	or available i			7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 44	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.60	4.80
		ould you discu			7	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	32/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.57	4.34	4.40
		help you disci			0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.40	136/ 326	4.49	4.49	4.57	3.97	4.40
5. DIG CO.	nierences	neip you carry	out lie	activities	U	2	U	U	U	2	9	4.82	130/ 320	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	4.82
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	h proctors for	all the	students	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00
	Frequ								n									
Credits E	arned	3			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		~		,				0	TT	1	2	37		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ge	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	2
84-150	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0											0			1			1-
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					ΕŢ	ectiv	/es				0	#### - 1				_	111
	Р 0 I 0					Οt-	ho				1	.0	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcan	IL.	
	I 0					Ut.	her				1	.U						
				; U														

Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II

Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 1485 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies A 1 2 3						ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4 19	1027/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	759/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	972/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	339/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	6		1012/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	398/1434	4.78	4.58	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	718/1547	4.78	4.68	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	532/1554		4.38	4.10	4.24	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	995/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	784/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	642/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	813/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	****
Diamonian														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.75	262/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.75	288/1279	4.88	4.72	4.17	4.53	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.00	194/1269	4.00	4.72	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	692/ 878	4.40		4.05	4.33	3.58
4. Weie special techniques successiul	U	4		U	5	3	3	3.30	092/ 0/0	4.40	4.34	4.05	4.33	3.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.80	4.80	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00
mi al di manda														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	4.07	4.90	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.73	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	92/ 326		4.49	4.03	3.97	4.93
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	U	1	U	U	U	Т	14	4.93	92/ 320	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	4.93
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00
Freq	ena	r Dia	rih	1+101	า									
FIEdr	.ciic y	בבט		A C I OI										

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
	P 0		0			responses to	be si	gnificant				

I 0 Other 13