| | | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.53	4.31	4.31	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	715/1447	4.55	4.60	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	4	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	646/1241	4.73	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	766/1402	4.36	4.56	4.24	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	345/1358	4.43	4.48	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	392/1316	4.49	4.51	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	775/1427	4.48	4.57	4.19	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.77	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1203/1434	3.90	4.26	4.10	3.97	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	870/1387	4.74	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	5	1	10	4.31	1237/1387	4.59	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	577/1386	4.70	4.66	4.32	4.24	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	887/1380	4.50	4.65	4.32	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	199/1193	4.52	4.35	4.02	4.04	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	377/1172	4.44	4.62	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	676/1182	4.49	4.73	4.35	4.30	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	695/1170	4.68	4.78	4.38	4.32	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	356/ 800	4.32	4.39	4.06	4.01	4.21
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  2                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1331
Title          Info Tech In Social Wo          Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Lopez,Christina                 Spring 2010                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 25                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	1138/1447	4.20	4.53	4.31	4.31	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	413/1447	4.55	4.60	4.27	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	6	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.73	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	735/1402	4.36	4.56	4.24	4.24	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	387/1358	4.43	4.48	4.11	4.12	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	476/1316	4.49	4.51	4.14	4.08	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	237/1427	4.48	4.57	4.19	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.86	4.77	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	969/1434	3.90	4.26	4.10	3.97	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	160/1387	4.74	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	1116/1387	4.59	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	392/1386	4.70	4.66	4.32	4.24	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	699/1380	4.50	4.65	4.32	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	478/1193	4.52	4.35	4.02	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	546/1172	4.44	4.62	4.15	4.12	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	653/1182	4.49	4.73	4.35	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	377/1170	4.68	4.78	4.38	4.32	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	408/ 800	4.32	4.39	4.06	4.01	4.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	4.75	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.67	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.33	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

```
                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      3       0.00-0.99   0       A    7       Required for Majors   9    Graduate     0       Major      12
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B    4
56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0       C    0       General               0    Under-grad   25      Non-major  13
84-150     1       3.00-3.49   2       D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1       F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 240  3                  University of Maryland                              Page 1332
Title         Info Tech In Social Wo            Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Morris,Katherin                    Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires:  15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  1  2  11  4.47  640/1447  4.20  4.53  4.31  4.31  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5  10  4.67  352/1447  4.55  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  0  0  1   8  4.89  159/1241  4.73  4.65  4.33  4.35  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53  459/1402  4.36  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  3   9  4.33  529/1358  4.43  4.48  4.11  4.12  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  2  3  10  4.53  362/1316  4.49  4.51  4.14  4.08  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3  2  10  4.47  513/1427  4.48  4.57  4.19  4.14  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  0  1  13  4.67  958/1447  4.86  4.77  4.69  4.70  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 1 0  1  5   7  4.21  679/1434  3.90  4.26  4.10  3.97  4.21


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  261/1387  4.74  4.67  4.46  4.42  4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93  369/1387  4.59  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87  182/1386  4.70  4.66  4.32  4.24  4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  3  11  4.79  299/1380  4.50  4.65  4.32  4.30  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0  0  1  3  11  4.67  186/1193  4.52  4.35  4.02  4.04  4.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  7   7  4.50  377/1172  4.44  4.62  4.15  4.12  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  4  10  4.71  382/1182  4.49  4.73  4.35  4.30  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0  0  1  12  4.92  178/1170  4.68  4.78  4.38  4.32  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   2  0  0  0  4   8  4.67  133/ 800  4.32  4.39  4.06  4.01  4.67


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  3  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0  1   3  4.75   43/ 192  4.75  4.75  4.34  4.38  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 2 0 0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.46  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13 1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.15  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11 2 0 0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0 0 0  1   2  4.67 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0  0  2   1  4.33 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    12  0  0  0  0  1   2  4.67 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12  0  0  0  0  2   1  4.33 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.70  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0  1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49  2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13 0  1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25  3.25  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12  2  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  ****  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13  1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  1                  University of Maryland                                   Page 1333
Title       Intro Social Work I              Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Sanders Baffour                  Spring 2010                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   32
Questionnaires: 30                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies       Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   7   0  1  2  6  7  7  3.74 1265/1447  4.32  4.53  4.31  4.31  3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7   0  1  2  5  8  7  3.78 1217/1447  4.25  4.60  4.27  4.23  3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7   0  1  2  4  6 10  3.96  956/1241  4.24  4.65  4.33  4.35  3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7   0  1  3  6  7  6  3.61 1227/1402  4.13  4.56  4.24  4.24  3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7  0  1  3  4  8  7  3.74 1036/1358  4.20  4.48  4.11  4.12  3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 3 1 4 11 4  3.52 1124/1316  4.06  4.51  4.14  4.08  3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            7   0  0  3  4  9  7  3.87 1103/1427  4.25  4.57  4.19  4.14  3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7   0  0  1  0  5 17  4.65  968/1447  4.79  4.77  4.69  4.70  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 1 1 9 6 1  3.28 1307/1434  3.87  4.26  4.10  3.97  3.28


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0  1  1  6  9  5  3.73 1268/1387  4.21  4.67  4.46  4.42  3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0  0  0  4  4 13  4.43 1191/1387  4.63  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8  0  1  1  5 10  5  3.77 1184/1386  4.27  4.66  4.32  4.24  3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0  3  3  2  7  6  3.48 1253/1380  4.10  4.65  4.32  4.30  3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 5 3 3 3 7  3.19 1052/1193  4.01  4.35  4.02  4.04  3.19


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 3 1 4 4 8  3.65  931/1172  4.21  4.62  4.15  4.12  3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 3 9 8  4.25  737/1182  4.55  4.73  4.35  4.30  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 5 8 7  4.10  851/1170  4.55  4.78  4.38  4.32  4.10
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   2  0  4  6  6  2  3.33  701/ 800  3.86  4.39  4.06  4.01  3.33


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  28   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.75  4.34  4.38  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.46  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.15  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.70  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49  2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 29  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25  3.25  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  ****  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    29   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      29   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       29   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     29   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  ****  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 260  2                University of Maryland                                    Page 1334
Title      Intro Social Work I             Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Jani,Jayshree S              Spring 2010                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   31
Questionnaires: 30                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  3 27  4.90  148/1447  4.32  4.53  4.31 4.31  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3  2 24  4.72  281/1447  4.25  4.60  4.27 4.23  4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  1  6 21  4.53  514/1241  4.24  4.65  4.33 4.35  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  0  7 21  4.66  325/1402  4.13  4.56  4.24 4.24  4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  7 22  4.67  237/1358  4.20  4.48  4.11 4.12  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 3 23  4.60  292/1316  4.06  4.51  4.14 4.08  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  3  1 25  4.63  310/1427  4.25  4.57  4.19 4.14  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2 28  4.93  339/1447  4.79  4.77  4.69 4.70  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2 1 0 0 8 13  4.45  397/1434  3.87  4.26  4.10 3.97  4.45


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  7 22  4.70  521/1387  4.21  4.67  4.46 4.42  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  2  1 27  4.83  707/1387  4.63  4.81  4.73 4.71  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  5 24  4.77  303/1386  4.27  4.66  4.32 4.24  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  6 22  4.72  379/1380  4.10  4.65  4.32 4.30  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 3 24  4.82   93/1193  4.01  4.35  4.02 4.04  4.82


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  2  2 21  4.76  210/1172  4.21  4.62  4.15 4.12  4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  1  0  1 23  4.84  261/1182  4.55  4.73  4.35 4.30  4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 25  5.00    1/1170  4.55  4.78  4.38 4.32  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   2  1  0  3  4 15  4.39  255/ 800  3.86  4.39  4.06 4.01  4.39


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  25  2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.75  4.34 4.38  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 2 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.46  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.15  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 0 7  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 6  4.86 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 0 6  4.43 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.70  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 27  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49 2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 27  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25 3.25  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       27  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52 ****  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   27  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30 ****  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 27  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43 ****  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    28  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      28  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       28  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     28  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 360  1                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1335
Title       Soc Welfare/Pol/Work I             Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Tice,Carolyn J                   Spring 2010                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 30                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4  0  0  0  1  5  20  4.73  331/1447  4.41  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4  0  0  0  0  4  22  4.85  162/1447  4.42  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  0  0  0  2  5  19  4.65  392/1241  4.42  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4  0  0  0  2  5  19  4.65  325/1402  4.31  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  1  5  19  4.62  272/1358  4.39  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 6 18 4.62  283/1316  4.38  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4  0  0  0  2  7  17  4.58  373/1427  4.36  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4  0  0  0  0  1  25  4.96  194/1447  4.65  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 2 0 0 1 4 15 4.70 206/1434  4.25  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.70


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5  0  0  0  0  1  24  4.96   80/1387  4.63  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5  0  0  0  0  1  24  4.96  211/1387  4.85  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  4  21  4.84  206/1386  4.47  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5  0  0  0  0  1  24  4.96   64/1380  4.62  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 1 0 2 3 18 4.54  262/1193  4.25  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.54


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85  152/1172  4.48  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 1 19 4.95  119/1182  4.73  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 1 19 4.95 134/1170  4.72  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  3  1  0  1  5  10  4.35  279/ 800  4.30  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.35


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.38  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.50  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     29  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  5.00  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   16        Required for Majors  21      Graduate      0      Major        18
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    5
  56-83      4        2.00-2.99    1      C    0        General               0      Under-grad   30      Non-major    12
  84-150     2        3.00-3.49    4      D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    8      F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
```

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

```
Course-Section: SOWK 360  2                      University of Maryland                              Page 1336
Title          Soc Welfare/Pol/Work I            Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Sanders Baffour                   Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 11                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                     Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1  0  0  1  4  1   4  3.80 1238/1447  4.41  4.53  4.31  4.32  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2  0  0  1  3  3   2  3.67 1262/1447  4.42  4.60  4.27  4.23  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2  0  0  2  2  2   3  3.67 1096/1241  4.42  4.65  4.33  4.33  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  1  0  2  4  0   3  3.44 1277/1402  4.31  4.56  4.24  4.24  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  1  3  0   5  4.00  799/1358  4.39  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 2 0   4  3.75  997/1316  4.38  4.51  4.14  4.13  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  1  1  2  1   5  3.80 1144/1427  4.36  4.57  4.19  4.15  3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                 4  0  0  1  0  3   3  4.14 1311/1447  4.65  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 4 1  2  3.50 1238/1434  4.25  4.26  4.10  4.09  3.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  1  2  0   4  4.00 1176/1387  4.63  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0  0  0  1  1   6  4.63 1030/1387  4.85  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 1 1 1   4  3.75 1191/1386  4.47  4.66  4.32  4.30  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  1  2  0   5  4.13  984/1380  4.62  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 1 2 3  2  3.75  843/1193  4.25  4.35  4.02  4.05  3.75


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 0 4   2  3.86  830/1172  4.48  4.62  4.15  4.24  3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 2 0   5  4.43  621/1182  4.73  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 1  4  4.29  745/1170  4.72  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.29
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  0  1  0  0  2   3  4.00  423/ 800  4.30  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.00


                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0      A    3        Required for Majors   7    Graduate     0     Major        3
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0      B    2                                   
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99   1      C    2        General               0    Under-grad  11     Non-major    8
 84-150     1        3.00-3.49   1      D    0                                   
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   0      F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 360  3                University of Maryland                            Page 1337
Title        Soc Welfare/Pol/Work I        Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Eisenberg,David               Spring 2010                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 38                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  1  0  8 29  4.71  353/1447  4.41  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  6 30  4.74  270/1447  4.42  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  2 36  4.95   85/1241  4.42  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  4 33  4.84  136/1402  4.31  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  0  1  0  2  9 25  4.54  319/1358  4.39  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  0  8 29  4.78  143/1316  4.38  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  2  4 31  4.71  237/1427  4.36  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  6 32  4.84  646/1447  4.65  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  5  2  1  0  1  8 21  4.55  315/1434  4.25  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.55


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  3 34  4.92  180/1387  4.63  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  1 36  4.97  159/1387  4.85  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1  0  0  0  3  1 33  4.81  241/1386  4.47  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  2  4 31  4.78  299/1380  4.62  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  1  1  1  3  6 24  4.46  332/1193  4.25  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.46


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  0  0  1  8 28  4.73  240/1172  4.48  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  0  0  1  5 31  4.81  292/1182  4.73  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1  0  0  0  0  3 34  4.92  200/1170  4.72  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  9  1  1  1  4 21  4.54  184/ 800  4.30  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.54


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.75  4.34  4.20  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.38  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.50  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    37  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 387  1                   University of Maryland                                    Page 1338
Title        Pol/Prog/Serv:Children           Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Demidenko,Micha                  Spring 2010                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires:  26                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  0  0  0  4  21  4.84  211/1447  4.84  4.53  4.31 4.32  4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  2  22  4.84  162/1447  4.84  4.60  4.27 4.23  4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  0  4  21  4.84  195/1241  4.84  4.65  4.33 4.33  4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0  1  23  4.96   47/1402  4.96  4.56  4.24 4.24  4.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  2  5  18  4.64  251/1358  4.64  4.48  4.11 4.10  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0  0  3  22  4.88   86/1316  4.88  4.51  4.14 4.13  4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  0  2  23  4.92   69/1427  4.92  4.57  4.19 4.15  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  0  25  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.77  4.69 4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0  0  7  11  4.61  270/1434  4.61  4.26  4.10 4.09  4.61


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  4  20  4.83  307/1387  4.83  4.67  4.46 4.44  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  2  22  4.92  475/1387  4.92  4.81  4.73 4.71  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  0  3  21  4.88  171/1386  4.88  4.66  4.32 4.30  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0  4  19  4.83  250/1380  4.83  4.65  4.32 4.32  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0  2  4  17  4.65  193/1193  4.65  4.35  4.02 4.05  4.65


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  1  4  18  4.74  232/1172  4.74  4.62  4.15 4.24  4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  0  0  1  4  18  4.74  364/1182  4.74  4.73  4.35 4.42  4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0  0  3  20  4.87  264/1170  4.87  4.78  4.38 4.49  4.87
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   4  1  0  3  1  14  4.42  239/ 800  4.42  4.39  4.06 4.12  4.42


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 0 0 0 0   1  5.00 ****/ 192  ****  4.75  4.34 4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 0 0 0 0   1  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20 4.02  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25 0 0 0 0 0   1  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09 3.38  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49 4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43 4.50  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72 5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    25   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 388  1                University of Maryland                              Page 1339
Title        Human Behavior                  Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Okundaye,Joshua                   Spring 2010                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    32
Questionnaires: 30                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5   Mean     Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   9   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  148/1447  4.90  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  112/1447  4.90  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   9   0   0   0   0   1  20  4.95   71/1241  4.95  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    9   0   0   0   0   3  18  4.86  129/1402  4.86  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90   87/1358  4.90  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   1   2  17  4.80  128/1316  4.80  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9   0   0   1   0   1  19  4.81  154/1427  4.81  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9   1   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  619/1447  4.85  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 3 0  0   0   7   9  4.56  303/1434  4.56  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.56


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        9   0   0   0   0   3  18  4.86  276/1387  4.86  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   9   0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  528/1387  4.90  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0  0   0   0   2  17  4.89  147/1386  4.89  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     9   0   0   0   0   1  20  4.95   80/1380  4.95  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 7 2  0   1   0  10  4.23  493/1193  4.23  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.23


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   1  16  4.94   74/1172  4.94  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  0   0   3   0  14  4.65  450/1182  4.65  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0  0   1   2  14  4.76  377/1170  4.76  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  13   2   0   0   1   2  12  4.73  108/ 800  4.73  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.73


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 0  0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    28   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.38  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 29  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.50  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     29   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  15  ****  ****  4.61  5.00  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0        A   11        Required for Majors  14      Graduate     0      Major       13
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0        B    6
  56-83     2       2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               0      Under-grad   30     Non-major   17
  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
```

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

```
Course-Section: SOWK 389  1                     University of Maryland                                  Page 1340
Title        Human Behavior II                  Baltimore County                                      JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Chakmakian,Elis                    Spring 2010                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 23                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2   0   0   0   1   3  17  4.76   298/1447  4.48  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0   0   0   1   5  15  4.67   352/1447  4.41  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   0   0   1   8  13  4.55   505/1241  4.52  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   1   7  13  4.57   414/1402  4.43  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   0   0   8  14  4.64   258/1358  4.53  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  0   0   7  15  4.68   221/1316  4.46  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          1   0   0   0   1   5  16  4.68   265/1427  4.50  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                1   0   0   0   0  15   7  4.32  1216/1447  4.34  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 0  3   3   9  4.40   454/1434  4.16  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.40


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      3   0   0   0   0   5  15  4.75   429/1387  4.61  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84   681/1387  4.77  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0  0   0   0   3  16  4.84   206/1386  4.63  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   3   0   0   0   1   2  17  4.80   273/1380  4.61  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0  0   0   2   5  13  4.55   256/1193  4.38  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.55


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0  0   0   2   2  13  4.65   295/1172  4.52  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0  0   0   1   1  15  4.82   282/1182  4.69  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0   0   1  16  4.94   134/1170  4.74  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                6   1   0   1   0   3  12  4.63   150/ 800  4.28  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.63

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0       A    9      Required for Majors  18     Graduate      0      Major      17
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0       B    7
  56-83     5      2.00-2.99   3       C    0      General               0     Under-grad   23      Non-major   6
  84-150    3      3.00-3.49   2       D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5       F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   9   0   0   2   2   3  13  4.35   771/1447   4.48  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0   0   1   3   3  13  4.40   677/1447   4.41  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  10   0   1   0   0   2  16  4.68   357/1241   4.52  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   11   2   1   0   1   3  11  4.44   579/1402   4.43  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   2   3  14  4.63   258/1358   4.53  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   3   5  11  4.42   476/1316   4.46  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           10   0   0   1   2   3  13  4.47   500/1427   4.50  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 11   0   0   0   0  15   3  4.17  1301/1447   4.34  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 1 0  0   0   6   4  4.40   454/1434   4.16  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.40


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84   291/1387   4.61  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  10   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89   553/1387   4.77  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0  0   0   0   3  16  4.84   206/1386   4.63  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    10   0   0   0   1   2  16  4.79   299/1380   4.61  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 3 0  0   3   2   9  4.43   358/1193   4.38  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.43


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  1   0   2   1  13  4.47   402/1172   4.52  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0   0   1   1  15  4.82   282/1182   4.69  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  0   1   0  16  4.88   243/1170   4.74  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                 13   3   1   0   2   1   9  4.31   308/ 800   4.28  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.31
```

                                       Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     1         0.00-0.99    0        A    9      Required for Majors  13     Graduate      0      Major        13
28-55     0         1.00-1.99    0        B    3                                                       
56-83     0         2.00-2.99    0        C    0      General               0     Under-grad   29      Non-major    16
84-150    5         3.00-3.49    1        D    0
Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    3        F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 389  3                    University of Maryland                              Page 1342
Title          Human Behavior II                Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Singleton,Hanna                  Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 32                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
           -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  4 10 16  4.32  800/1447 4.48  4.53  4.31 4.32  4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  3  1  3  6 19  4.16  947/1447 4.41  4.60  4.27 4.23  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  3  1  9 17  4.33  717/1241 4.52  4.65  4.33 4.33  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  3  2 10 17  4.28  735/1402 4.43  4.56  4.24 4.24  4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  1  4  6 19  4.32  540/1358 4.53  4.48  4.11 4.10  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  0  4  6 19  4.29  581/1316 4.46  4.51  4.14 4.13  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  1  1  2  9 17  4.33  680/1427 4.50  4.57  4.19 4.15  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0 14 16  4.53 1060/1447 4.34  4.77  4.69 4.65  4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2  1  4  3 14  5  3.67 1150/1434 4.16  4.26  4.10 4.09  3.67


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  1  1  2 12 14  4.23 1055/1387 4.61  4.67  4.46 4.44  4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0  1 10 18  4.59 1072/1387 4.77  4.81  4.73 4.71  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  1  1  2 11 13  4.21  911/1386 4.63  4.66  4.32 4.30  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0  0  2  2 12 13  4.24  896/1380 4.61  4.65  4.32 4.32  4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  2  1  0 13 13  4.17  545/1193 4.38  4.35  4.02 4.05  4.17


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1 15 14  4.43  437/1172 4.52  4.62  4.15 4.24  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  5  7 18  4.43  612/1182 4.69  4.73  4.35 4.42  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  2  2  8 18  4.40  657/1170 4.74  4.78  4.38 4.49  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   2  2  1  6  8 11  3.89  517/ 800 4.28  4.39  4.06 4.12  3.89

                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      3         0.00-0.99   0      A   16         Required for Majors  25     Graduate      0        Major        26
 28-55      0         1.00-1.99   0      B    8
 56-83      5         2.00-2.99   2      C    0         General               0     Under-grad   32        Non-major     6
 84-150     3         3.00-3.49   6      D    0
 Grad.      0         3.50-4.00  11      F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0         Other                 0
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 390  1                      University of Maryland                                    Page 1343
Title          Spec Topics:Socl Welfa            Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Rohrbach,Alison                   Spring 2010                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  222/1447  4.75  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1447  4.89  4.60  4.27  4.23  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1241  4.86  4.65  4.33  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  143/1402  4.75  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1358  5.00  4.48  4.11  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   1   0   5  4.67  239/1316  4.61  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  133/1427  4.81  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.77  4.69  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1  0   0   0   2   1  4.33  540/1434  4.54  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.33


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.67  4.46  4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  194/1386  4.93  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  216/1380  4.93  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   0   0   1   5  4.83   89/1193  4.92  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.83


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1172  4.88  4.62  4.15  4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1182  5.00  4.73  4.35  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1170  4.88  4.78  4.38  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  133/ 800  4.67  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.67

                                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SOWK 390  2                University of Maryland                              Page 1344
Title         Spec Topics:Socl Welfa       Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Rohrbach,Alison              Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires: 9                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  408/1447  4.75  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  228/1447  4.89  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  323/1241  4.86  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  314/1402  4.75  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1358  5.00  4.48  4.11  4.10  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  342/1316  4.61  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  181/1427  4.81  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.77  4.69  4.65  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0  0  0  1  3  4.75  158/1434  4.54  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.75


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.67  4.46  4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.81  4.73  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1386  4.93  4.66  4.32  4.30  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1380  4.93  4.65  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1193  4.92  4.35  4.02  4.05  5.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  218/1172  4.88  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1182  5.00  4.73  4.35  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  390/1170  4.88  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  133/ 800  4.67  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.67

                                Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   8      Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major         1
28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0      B   0
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C   0      General              0    Under-grad   9      Non-major     8
84-150     5      3.00-3.49    0      D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F   0      Electives            7    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                     I   0      Other                1
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 395  1                     University of Maryland                               Page 1345
Title         Addictive Behav Patter               Baltimore County                                 JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Okundaye,Joshua                      Spring 2010                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  0  19  5.00   1/1447   5.00  4.53  4.31  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  17  4.89  120/1447   4.89  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  1  8   9  4.44  611/1241   4.44  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1  0  0  0  3  14  4.82  150/1402   4.82  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  2  16  4.79  151/1358   4.79  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4  15  4.79  143/1316   4.79  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  0  3  15  4.68  265/1427   4.68  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  2  17  4.89  511/1447   4.89  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 1 0 5  10  4.50  341/1434   4.50  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  2  17  4.89  215/1387   4.89  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  19  5.00   1/1387   5.00  4.81  4.73  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  2  3  13  4.61  496/1386   4.61  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  2  17  4.89  170/1380   4.89  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 1 0 3  3   5  3.92  748/1193   3.92  4.35  4.02  4.05  3.92


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1  17  4.94   74/1172   4.94  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0  18  5.00   1/1182   5.00  4.73  4.35  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1  17  4.94  134/1170   4.94  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.94
4. Were special techniques successful                 1  12  0  0  0  0   6  5.00   1/ 800   5.00  4.39  4.06  4.12  5.00


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99    1       A   10        Required for Majors   7     Graduate      0      Major        13
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                                                     
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99    0       C    2        General               0     Under-grad   19      Non-major     6
  84-150    4        3.00-3.49    2       D    0                                                                     
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    6       F    0        Electives             8     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 397  1                University of Maryland                               Page 1346
Title        Social Work Methods I         Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Jani,Jayshree S               Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires: 26                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  3  0  1  0  1  4  17  4.57  518/1447  4.79  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3  0  0  0  0  6  17  4.74  270/1447  4.78  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3  14  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  261/1241  4.86  4.65  4.33  4.33  4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   3  0  0  0  0  4  19  4.83  150/1402  4.82  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  8  13  4.48  377/1358  4.54  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  4  17  4.65  248/1316  4.75  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3  0  0  0  0  4  19  4.83  140/1427  4.69  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3  0  0  0  0  6  17  4.74  868/1447  4.82  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  1  0  0  1  7  10  4.50  341/1434  4.51  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.50


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4  0  0  0  0  3  19  4.86  261/1387  4.84  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4  0  0  0  0  1  21  4.95  264/1387  4.94  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  0  3  19  4.86  182/1386  4.88  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  0  0  7  15  4.68  434/1380  4.79  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  0  0  1  6  15  4.64  205/1193  4.74  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.64


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  4  15  4.70  261/1172  4.87  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  20  5.00    1/1182  4.84  4.73  4.35  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  0  20  5.00    1/1170  4.99  4.78  4.38  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  2  0  0  1  3  14  4.72  111/ 800  4.66  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.72


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 189  ****  ****  4.34  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 192  ****  4.75  4.34  4.20  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 186  ****  ****  4.48  4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 187  ****  ****  4.33  4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 168  ****  ****  4.20  4.02  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  62  ****  ****  4.56  4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.41  2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.42  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  64  ****  ****  4.09  3.38  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  3.67  4.49  4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  36  ****  4.33  4.25  3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.42  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.72  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  ****  4.57  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  20  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SOWK 397  2                    University of Maryland                              Page 1347
Title          Social Work Methods I           Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Knight,Carolyn                  Spring 2010                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 18              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88  179/1447  4.79 4.53  4.31 4.32  4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  4  12  4.75  249/1447  4.78 4.60  4.27 4.23  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  11  0  0  0  1   4  4.80  231/1241  4.86 4.65  4.33 4.33  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  4  12  4.75  217/1402  4.82 4.56  4.24 4.24  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  2  6   7  4.33  529/1358  4.54 4.48  4.11 4.10  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  1  2  12  4.73  181/1316  4.75 4.51  4.14 4.13  4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  0  0  3  2  10  4.47  513/1427  4.69 4.57  4.19 4.15  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80  754/1447  4.82 4.77  4.69 4.65  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  1  0  5   8  4.43  431/1434  4.51 4.26  4.10 4.09  4.43


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  2  14  4.88  245/1387  4.84 4.67  4.46 4.44  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94  369/1387  4.94 4.81  4.73 4.71  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81  241/1386  4.88 4.66  4.32 4.30  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  3  13  4.81  261/1380  4.79 4.65  4.32 4.32  4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 14  0  0  1  1   0  3.50  ****/1193  4.74 4.35  4.02 4.05  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00    1/1172  4.87 4.62  4.15 4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  1  0  14  4.87  240/1182  4.84 4.73  4.35 4.42  4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00    1/1170  4.99 4.78  4.38 4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   2  1  0  0  3   9  4.46  217/ 800  4.66 4.39  4.06 4.12  4.46


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  38  **** 3.67  4.49 4.73  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17   0  0  1  0  0   0  2.00  ****/  36  **** 4.33  4.25 3.81  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00  ****/  28  **** ****  4.52 4.46  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  30  **** ****  4.30 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17   0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  27  **** ****  4.43 4.50  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    7       Required for Majors  14      Graduate    0       Major        15
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    7
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    3       C    1       General               0      Under-grad  18      Non-major     3
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    2       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5       F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 397  3                      University of Maryland                                     Page 1348
Title          Social Work Methods I             Baltimore County                                          JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Morris,Katherin                   Spring 2010                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 28                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   0  27  4.93  118/1447  4.79  4.53  4.31  4.32  4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2  25  4.86  154/1447  4.78  4.60  4.27  4.23  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  13   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1241  4.86  4.65  4.33  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1  26  4.89  100/1402  4.82  4.56  4.24  4.24  4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   0   1   3  23  4.81  132/1358  4.54  4.48  4.11  4.10  4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   0   1   2  24  4.85  102/1316  4.75  4.51  4.14  4.13  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   2   2  23  4.78  181/1427  4.69  4.57  4.19  4.15  4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   2  25  4.93  388/1447  4.82  4.77  4.69  4.65  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  1   0   1   3  17  4.59  284/1434  4.51  4.26  4.10  4.09  4.59

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   4  21  4.77  414/1387  4.84  4.67  4.46  4.44  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   0  25  4.92  422/1387  4.94  4.81  4.73  4.71  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   0   1  25  4.96   55/1386  4.88  4.66  4.32  4.30  4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   1   1  24  4.88  181/1380  4.79  4.65  4.32  4.32  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0   0   0   1   2  23  4.85   86/1193  4.74  4.35  4.02  4.05  4.85

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   0   1   0  23  4.92  111/1172  4.87  4.62  4.15  4.24  4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0   0   2   4  18  4.67  430/1182  4.84  4.73  4.35  4.42  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0   0   0   0   1  23  4.96  112/1170  4.99  4.78  4.38  4.49  4.96
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   0   0   0   1   3  20  4.79   92/ 800  4.66  4.39  4.06  4.12  4.79

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.17  ****
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1         0.00-0.99   0        A   16      Required for Majors  23      Graduate     0       Major       26
  28-55      1         1.00-1.99   0        B    8
  56-83      9         2.00-2.99   1        C    0      General               1      Under-grad  28       Non-major    2
  84-150     5         3.00-3.49   7        D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00  15        F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                            I    0      Other                 0
                                            ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 470  1                    University of Maryland                              Page 1349
Title         Social Work Research             Baltimore County                                    JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Wiechelt,Shelly                  Spring 2010                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   21
Questionnaires: 21                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies            Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
                ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    3   0   0   0   0   6  12  4.67  408/1447  4.67  4.53  4.31  4.43  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0   0   0   1   2  15  4.78  228/1447  4.78  4.60  4.27  4.31  4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4   0   0   0   0   4  13  4.76  272/1241  4.76  4.65  4.33  4.41  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0   1   0   0   3  14  4.61  369/1402  4.61  4.56  4.24  4.34  4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   1   2   2  13  4.50  345/1358  4.50  4.48  4.11  4.15  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0   0   0   2   6  10  4.44  455/1316  4.44  4.51  4.14  4.27  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0   0   0   0   1  17  4.94   52/1427  4.94  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0   0   0   0   0  18  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.77  4.69  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   1   9   7  4.35  516/1434  4.35  4.26  4.10  4.17  4.35


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0   0   0   0   1  16  4.94  120/1387  4.94  4.67  4.46  4.48  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0   0   0   0   1  16  4.94  317/1387  4.94  4.81  4.73  4.76  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0   0   0   1   2  14  4.76  303/1386  4.76  4.66  4.32  4.34  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00    1/1380  5.00  4.65  4.32  4.34  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  1   0   0   0   2  14  4.88   75/1193  4.88  4.35  4.02  4.00  4.88


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   1   2   2  11  4.44  437/1172  4.44  4.62  4.15  4.25  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0   0   0   1   3  12  4.69  410/1182  4.69  4.73  4.35  4.49  4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81  316/1170  4.81  4.78  4.38  4.51  4.81
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   4   4   1   1   2   4  3.08  739/ 800  3.08  4.39  4.06  4.19  3.08

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                     Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    0          0.00-0.99   0        A    3         Required for Majors  15        Graduate    0         Major       17
28-55    0          1.00-1.99   0        B    9                                                                         
56-83    0          2.00-2.99   2        C    2         General               0        Under-grad  21        Non-major    4
84-150   3          3.00-3.49   4        D    0
Grad.    0          3.50-4.00   3        F    0         Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                         I    0         Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 483  1                      University of Maryland                                    Page 1350
Title           Social Work Methods II            Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:     Knight,Carolyn                    Spring 2010                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 13                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83  222/1447  4.37 4.53  4.31 4.43  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  100/1447  4.53 4.60  4.27 4.31  4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   5  0  0  0  0   6  5.00    1/1241  4.74 4.65  4.33 4.41  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  0  1  10  4.91   93/1402  4.65 4.56  4.24 4.34  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  2  2   7  4.45  398/1358  4.18 4.48  4.11 4.15  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  0  0  2  10  4.83  112/1316  4.42 4.51  4.14 4.27  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  4   8  4.67  283/1427  4.52 4.57  4.19 4.20  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  5   6  4.55 1054/1447  4.79 4.77  4.69 4.72  4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  0  3   7  4.70  206/1434  4.25 4.26  4.10 4.17  4.70

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83  307/1387  4.41 4.67  4.46 4.48  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  12  5.00    1/1387  4.76 4.81  4.73 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92  122/1386  4.58 4.66  4.32 4.34  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  0  11  4.83  238/1380  4.56 4.65  4.32 4.34  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6 1  1  0  1   3  3.67  895/1193  3.92 4.35  4.02 4.00  3.67

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1172  4.66 4.62  4.15 4.25  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00    1/1182  4.75 4.73  4.35 4.49  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  1  10  4.91  223/1170  4.79 4.78  4.38 4.51  4.91
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   0  0  0  0  4   6  4.60  159/ 800  4.61 4.39  4.06 4.19  4.60

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  38  3.67 3.67  4.49 4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  36  4.33 4.33  4.25 4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.52 4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  30  **** ****  4.30 4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.43 4.62  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A    5        Required for Majors  10      Graduate      0      Major      8
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    5
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General               0      Under-grad   13      Non-major  5
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49   2       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   5       F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 483  2                    University of Maryland                              Page 1351
Title       Social Work Methods II             Baltimore County                                   JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Bembry,James X                     Spring 2010                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 19                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2   0  0  0  0   2  15  4.88  169/1447  4.37  4.53  4.31  4.43  4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0  0  0  1   1  15  4.82  179/1447  4.53  4.60  4.27  4.31  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   8  0  0  0   1   8  4.89  159/1241  4.74  4.65  4.33  4.41  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  0   3  14  4.82  150/1402  4.65  4.56  4.24  4.34  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  2  0  0  0  2  2  13  4.65  251/1358  4.18  4.48  4.11  4.15  4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  2  0  0  0  0  2  15  4.88  86/1316  4.42  4.51  4.14  4.27  4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0  0  0  0   2  15  4.88   99/1427  4.52  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0   5  12  4.71  918/1447  4.79  4.77  4.69  4.72  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  141/1434  4.25  4.26  4.10  4.17  4.78


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0   1  16  4.94  120/1387  4.41  4.67  4.46  4.48  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  0  0  0   0  16  5.00    1/1387  4.76  4.81  4.73  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  5  0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86  194/1386  4.58  4.66  4.32  4.34  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  0  0   0  16  5.00    1/1380  4.56  4.65  4.32  4.34  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  3  0  1  2  0  4  9  4.13  593/1193  3.92  4.35  4.02  4.00  4.13


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  4  0  0  0  0  1  14  4.93  87/1172  4.66  4.62  4.15  4.25  4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  4  0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00   1/1182  4.75  4.73  4.35  4.49  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4  0  0  0  0  0  15  5.00   1/1170  4.79  4.78  4.38  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   0  0  0  0   6   9  4.60  159/ 800  4.61  4.39  4.06  4.19  4.60


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 192  ****  4.75  4.34  4.61  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  18  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  66  ****  ****  4.58  4.87  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  38  3.67  3.67  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  36  4.33  4.33  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.62  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2      0.00-0.99    0       A   11       Required for Majors  13     Graduate      0       Major        9
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    2
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    1       C    0       General               0     Under-grad   19       Non-major   10
  84-150    8      3.00-3.49    1       D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    6       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 483  3                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1352
Title          Social Work Methods II          Baltimore County                                         JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Ting,Laura                      Spring 2010                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                      NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0   2   0   2   4   8  4.00 1058/1447  4.37  4.53  4.31  4.43  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0   0   0   1   8   7  4.38  715/1447  4.53  4.60  4.27  4.31  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  15   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1241  4.74  4.65  4.33  4.41  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   1   0   0   1   3  11  4.67  314/1402  4.65  4.56  4.24  4.34  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5  0   2   1   4   2   6  3.60 1125/1358  4.18  4.48  4.11  4.15  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 1  0   1   1   5   7  4.29  590/1316  4.42  4.51  4.14  4.27  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            6   0   0   2   0   4   8  4.29  739/1427  4.52  4.57  4.19  4.20  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00    1/1447  4.79  4.77  4.69  4.72  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  1   1   2   7   2  3.62 1181/1434  4.25  4.26  4.10  4.17  3.62

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   1   1   2   2   9  4.13 1124/1387  4.41  4.67  4.46  4.48  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   1   1  13  4.80  784/1387  4.76  4.81  4.73  4.76  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0   0   1   2   1  11  4.47  663/1386  4.58  4.66  4.32  4.34  4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   1   0   2   2  10  4.33  815/1380  4.56  4.65  4.32  4.34  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 3  2   1   2   1   5  3.55  946/1193  3.92  4.35  4.02  4.00  3.55

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   1   0   1   2   9  4.38  479/1172  4.66  4.62  4.15  4.25  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   0   1   0  12  4.85  261/1182  4.75  4.73  4.35  4.49  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   1   0  12  4.85  285/1170  4.79  4.78  4.38  4.51  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   3   0   0   0   2   8  4.80   90/ 800  4.61  4.39  4.06  4.19  4.80

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  16  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/  38  3.67  3.67  4.49  4.68  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  16  0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/  36  4.33  4.33  4.25  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        17  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    17  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.30  4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  17  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.43  4.62  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       0         0.00-0.99    0     A   11       Required for Majors  14   Graduate      0    Major      16
28-55       0         1.00-1.99    0     B    3                                 
56-83       0         2.00-2.99    1     C    0       General               0   Under-grad   20    Non-major   4
84-150      9         3.00-3.49    5     D    0                                 
Grad.       0         3.50-4.00    5     F    0       Electives             0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SOWK 483  4                  University of Maryland                                    Page 1353
Title        Social Work Methods II           Baltimore County                                        JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Rockwood,Jane M                  Spring 2010                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  12                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  0  1  5  2  4  3.75 1257/1447  4.37 4.53  4.31 4.43  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  1  3  3  5  4.00 1053/1447  4.53 4.60  4.27 4.31  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   9  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  717/1241  4.74 4.65  4.33 4.41  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      1   1  0  0  4  0  6  4.20  827/1402  4.65 4.56  4.24 4.34  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  3  1  1  7  4.00  799/1358  4.18 4.48  4.11 4.15  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  3  4  3  3.67 1050/1316  4.42 4.51  4.14 4.27  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  2  0  3  7  4.25  775/1427  4.52 4.57  4.19 4.20  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  436/1447  4.79 4.77  4.69 4.72  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  3  4  2  3.89  996/1434  4.25 4.26  4.10 4.17  3.89


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0  0  2  3  3  4  3.75 1262/1387  4.41 4.67  4.46 4.48  3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0  0  1  2  2  7  4.25 1260/1387  4.76 4.81  4.73 4.76  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0  0  1  2  4  5  4.08 1014/1386  4.58 4.66  4.32 4.34  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0  0  1  2  4  5  4.08 1003/1380  4.56 4.65  4.32 4.34  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0  0  1  2  1  8  4.33  420/1193  3.92 4.35  4.02 4.00  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  1  1  3  7  4.33  521/1172  4.66 4.62  4.15 4.25  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0  0  0  3  4  5  4.17  788/1182  4.75 4.73  4.35 4.49  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  648/1170  4.79 4.78  4.38 4.51  4.42
4. Were special techniques successful                    0   3  0  0  2  1  6  4.44  228/ 800  4.61 4.39  4.06 4.19  4.44


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   9   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67   35/  38  3.67 3.67  4.49 4.68  3.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    9   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   18/  36  4.33 4.33  4.25 4.42  4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         10   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.52 4.72  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     11   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  **** ****  4.30 4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   11   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.43 4.62  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99    0       A   8       Required for Majors  8    Graduate      0     Major        9
  28-55     0         1.00-1.99    0       B   2
  56-83     0         2.00-2.99    0       C   0       General              0    Under-grad   12     Non-major    3
  84-150    2         3.00-3.49    1       D   0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00    6       F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0                                responses to be significant
                                           I   0       Other                0
                                           ?   0
```