

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LARSEN, KELLI M
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1545
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1599/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	419/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1285/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1400/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96	3.91	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	1110/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1651	4.22	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.84	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1237/1656	4.12	4.28	4.07	4.10	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	0	6	4.09	1456/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	589/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	857/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	161/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	0	1	5	3.67	1092/1520	3.75	4.46	4.01	4.03	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	0	0	6	4.00	1024/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	1210/1511	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	600/ 994	3.56	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	3.63	3.63	4.44	4.42	****	

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	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	9	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0601
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1546
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	3	2	4.40	768/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	737/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	769/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	737/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.22	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	4.84	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	310/1656	4.12	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1225/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	810/1520	3.75	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1511	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	3.56	3.99	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	3.55	3.55	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	3.50	3.83	3.93	4.20	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	3.63	3.63	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0601
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1546
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8020
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1547
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	1628/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1479/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1332/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1507/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	1509/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1513/1651	4.22	4.57	4.18	4.20	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.84	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	955/1656	4.12	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1430/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1374/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1272/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1264/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	622/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1169/1520	3.75	4.46	4.01	4.03	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	759/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	811/ 994	3.56	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	249/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	150/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	252/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	3.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	223/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	89/ 103	3.55	3.55	4.41	4.07	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	80/ 95	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.33	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	86/ 99	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	3.50	3.83	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	44/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	3.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	39/ 52	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.53	3.67	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	47/ 50	3.63	3.63	4.44	4.42	3.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8020
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1547
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8021
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1548
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	0	3	8	4.14	1075/1674	3.68	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	578/1674	4.27	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1016/1423	3.63	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1260/1609	3.94	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	2	2	3	2.92	1485/1585	3.27	4.05	3.96	3.91	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1022/1535	3.60	4.33	4.08	4.03	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1050/1651	4.22	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1040/1673	4.84	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	882/1656	4.12	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1260/1586	4.29	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	1300/1585	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	935/1582	4.34	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	958/1575	4.29	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	406/1380	4.49	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	967/1520	3.75	4.46	4.01	4.03	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	999/1515	4.16	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	535/1511	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.56	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	229/ 265	3.42	3.42	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	188/ 278	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.36	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 260	3.33	3.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 259	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 233	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	88/ 103	3.55	3.55	4.41	4.07	3.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.45	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	74/ 95	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.33	3.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.75	3.75	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 97	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	41/ 76	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	3.83	3.93	4.20	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	29/ 61	3.75	3.75	4.09	4.23	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 52	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	35/ 50	3.63	3.63	4.44	4.42	4.25	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8021
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1548
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1549
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	148/1674	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	96/1674	4.62	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	132/1423	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	141/1609	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	24	4.67	224/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	131/1535	4.65	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	81/1651	4.62	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1673	4.86	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	123/1656	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	284/1586	4.63	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	227/1585	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	189/1582	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	181/1575	4.68	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	207/1380	4.26	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	120/1520	4.70	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1515	4.81	4.61	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	122/1511	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	414/ 994	4.02	3.99	3.94	3.98	4.16	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	3.42	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	3.33	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	3.67	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.33	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.17	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.83	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.75	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.67	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	3.63	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1549
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1550
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	24	4.86	195/1674	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	110/1674	4.62	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	188/1423	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	25	4.82	162/1609	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	148/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	112/1535	4.65	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	163/1651	4.62	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	149/1656	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	231/1586	4.63	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	453/1585	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	161/1582	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	181/1575	4.68	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	143/1380	4.26	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	191/1520	4.70	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	242/1515	4.81	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	266/1511	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	7	2	13	4.27	351/ 994	4.02	3.99	3.94	3.98	4.27	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 28	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 260 8020
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: Planell, Joan
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1551
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	406/1674	4.81	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	7	11	7	4.00	1146/1674	4.62	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	7	1	0	6	5	3	3.60	1249/1423	4.44	4.42	4.27	4.36	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	1	6	12	4	3.83	1272/1609	4.50	4.48	4.22	4.23	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	10	10	4.04	742/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	619/1535	4.65	4.33	4.08	4.03	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	3	12	9	4.12	1009/1651	4.62	4.57	4.18	4.20	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	1015/1673	4.86	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	805/1656	4.62	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	1230/1586	4.63	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	510/1585	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	1052/1582	4.63	4.54	4.26	4.35	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	949/1575	4.68	4.56	4.27	4.39	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	2	1	5	5	3	3.38	1108/1380	4.26	4.05	3.94	4.03	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	529/1520	4.70	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	594/1515	4.81	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	751/1511	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	691/ 994	4.02	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.45	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.17	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.83	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.75	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.67	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	3.63	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	15
?	0		

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0101
 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1552
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.52	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.42	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.48	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.05	3.96	3.91	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.33	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.57	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.28	4.07	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.55	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	200/1380	4.67	4.05	3.94	4.03	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.61	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.99	3.94	3.98	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0101
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1553
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	13	4.81	233/1674	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	96/1674	4.36	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	575/1423	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	222/1609	4.22	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	131/1585	4.45	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	127/1535	4.26	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	445/1651	4.42	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1114/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	214/1656	4.13	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	150/1586	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	180/1582	4.25	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1575	4.30	4.56	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	155/1380	4.13	4.05	3.94	4.01	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	94/1520	4.59	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	483/1515	4.51	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	289/1511	4.83	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	447/ 994	3.68	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.09	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 16

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I
 Instructor: HALL, DIANE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1554
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	6	8	5	3.64	1464/1674	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.26	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	1358/1674	4.36	4.52	4.23	4.21	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	5	10	4.09	962/1423	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	4	6	7	3.68	1366/1609	4.22	4.48	4.22	4.27	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	708/1585	4.45	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	7	5	7	3.71	1177/1535	4.26	4.33	4.08	4.15	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	832/1651	4.42	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	887/1673	4.71	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	12	5	3	3.55	1353/1656	4.13	4.28	4.07	4.07	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	8	6	6	3.73	1424/1586	4.33	4.55	4.43	4.42	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	1367/1585	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	8	5	3.62	1367/1582	4.25	4.54	4.26	4.26	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	7	6	3.59	1351/1575	4.30	4.56	4.27	4.25	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	8	4	6	3.52	1028/1380	4.13	4.05	3.94	4.01	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	645/1520	4.59	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	808/1515	4.51	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	358/1511	4.83	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	2	1	7	1	4	3.27	832/ 994	3.68	3.99	3.94	3.96	3.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOWK 387 8020
 Title POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN
 Instructor: Love, Yvonna
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1555
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	9	4.64	445/1674	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	528/1423	4.55	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	567/1609	4.45	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	260/1535	4.64	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	816/1586	4.55	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	481/1582	4.64	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	537/1575	4.64	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	831/1380	3.86	4.05	3.94	4.01	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	185/1520	4.82	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	420/1515	4.73	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	535/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	139/ 994	4.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.70	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1556
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	254/1674	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	270/1674	4.42	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	1	3	19	4.63	431/1423	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	109/1609	4.42	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	20	4.67	224/1585	3.59	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	319/1535	4.19	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	104/1651	4.28	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	465/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	192/1586	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	640/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	136/1582	4.44	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	203/1575	4.53	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	****/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	179/1520	4.52	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1515	4.76	4.61	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	2	4	0	6	3.83	600/ 994	3.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	3.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	1
				Other	23
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: SKIBA, DAVID
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1557
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	4	4	4	3.35	1558/1674	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.26	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	7	4	3.75	1370/1674	4.42	4.52	4.23	4.21	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1169/1423	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.27	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	0	8	4	3.93	1198/1609	4.42	4.48	4.22	4.27	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	3	3	1	2.35	1556/1585	3.59	4.05	3.96	3.95	2.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1147/1535	4.19	4.33	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	1	5	6	3.47	1454/1651	4.28	4.57	4.18	4.16	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	4	2	2	5	3.43	1412/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.07	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	837/1586	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1158/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1378/1582	4.44	4.54	4.26	4.26	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1254/1575	4.53	4.56	4.27	4.25	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	7	2	4	3.29	1145/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	942/1520	4.52	4.46	4.01	4.09	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	629/1515	4.76	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1004/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	927/ 994	3.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	3.42	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	3.33	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	3.67	4.33	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	3.55	4.41	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOWK 388 8020
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: Thiel, Mindy
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1558
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	23	4.76	298/1674	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	270/1674	4.42	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	517/1423	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	629/1609	4.42	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	3	8	11	3.75	1049/1585	3.59	4.05	3.96	3.95	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	667/1535	4.19	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	583/1651	4.28	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	972/1673	4.90	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	257/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	231/1586	4.78	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	591/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	227/1582	4.44	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	181/1575	4.53	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	173/1380	4.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	156/1520	4.52	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	336/1515	4.76	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	289/1511	4.64	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	297/ 994	3.70	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 31 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1559
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	287/1674	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	110/1674	4.86	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	146/1423	4.79	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	97/1609	4.65	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	326/1585	4.45	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	119/1535	4.77	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	151/1651	4.82	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	283/1673	4.42	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	178/1656	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	618/1586	4.79	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	24	4.81	811/1585	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	4	20	4.68	423/1582	4.78	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	69/1575	4.86	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	5	0	2	1	2	2.50	1324/1380	2.50	4.05	3.94	4.01	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	162/1520	4.80	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	207/1515	4.82	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	244/1511	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	193/ 994	4.54	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.54	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 27 Non-major 9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1560
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	0	7	4.30	891/1674	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	215/1674	4.86	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1423	4.79	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	687/1609	4.65	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	413/1585	4.45	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	215/1535	4.77	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	175/1651	4.82	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1626/1673	4.42	4.73	4.69	4.68	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.38	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	249/1586	4.79	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.84	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.78	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	359/1575	4.86	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1380	2.50	4.05	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	229/1520	4.80	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	384/1515	4.82	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	4.54	3.99	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101
 Title ADVOCATES PROGRAM
 Instructor: HARVEY, ALISON
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1561
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.52	4.23	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.48	4.22	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.57	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390J 0101
 Title ADDICTIVE BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: DVORAK, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1562
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	15	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	737/1674	4.41	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	870/1423	4.23	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	466/1609	4.52	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	13	4.32	502/1585	4.32	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	15	4.41	508/1535	4.41	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	2	15	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.73	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	901/1586	4.47	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	510/1582	4.61	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	407/1575	4.72	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	325/1380	4.47	4.05	3.94	4.01	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	673/1520	4.22	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	533/1515	4.61	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	154/ 994	4.64	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 390W 0101
 Title SOWK PRACTICE IN AGING
 Instructor: Mays, Maria
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1563
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.52	4.23	4.21	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.48	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.57	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.28	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.55	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.56	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.05	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.61	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0101
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1564
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.36	4.27	4.26	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.52	4.23	4.21	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	277/1585	4.58	4.05	3.96	3.95	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.57	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.73	4.69	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	283/1656	4.64	4.28	4.07	4.07	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.55	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.56	4.27	4.25	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	134/1520	4.91	4.46	4.01	4.09	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	207/1515	4.91	4.61	4.24	4.32	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.91	4.69	4.27	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	189/ 994	4.55	3.99	3.94	3.96	4.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 470 0101
 Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1565
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	509/1674	4.29	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	554/1674	4.30	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	153/1423	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	242/1609	4.55	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	632/1585	4.19	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	355/1535	4.46	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	163/1651	4.78	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.73	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	301/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.19	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	128/1586	4.74	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	91/1582	4.37	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1575	4.30	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	666/1380	3.73	4.05	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	281/1520	4.14	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	242/1515	4.30	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	171/1511	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	297/ 994	3.88	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 470 8020
 Title SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH
 Instructor: TING, LAURA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1566
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3	2	8	4.00	1196/1674	4.29	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1104/1674	4.30	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1180/1423	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.34	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	715/1609	4.55	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	3	9	4.20	612/1585	4.19	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	508/1535	4.46	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	254/1651	4.78	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.97	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1237/1656	4.18	4.28	4.07	4.19	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	826/1586	4.74	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1071/1585	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1272/1582	4.37	4.54	4.26	4.31	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	7	4	3.67	1329/1575	4.30	4.56	4.27	4.35	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1059/1380	3.73	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1129/1520	4.14	4.46	4.01	4.18	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1221/1515	4.30	4.61	4.24	4.40	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1027/1511	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	791/ 994	3.88	3.99	3.94	4.19	3.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.21	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.00	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	3.63	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	3.75	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.00	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0101
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1567
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	7	4.67	406/1674	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	673/1674	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	353/1609	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	584/1585	3.92	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	870/1535	4.33	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	208/1651	4.67	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1146/1656	4.15	4.28	4.07	4.19	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	286/1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	635/1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	213/1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1515	4.72	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1511	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.13	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1568
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	2	13	4.75	298/1674	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	207/1674	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	147/1609	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	672/1585	3.92	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	169/1535	4.33	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	231/1651	4.67	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1541/1673	4.44	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	680/1656	4.15	4.28	4.07	4.19	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	753/1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	246/1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	214/1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	3	0	1	0	6	3.60	998/1380	3.41	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	229/1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1515	4.72	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1511	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	186/ 994	4.13	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	4.17	3.83	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 481 0301
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II
 Instructor: TING, LAURA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1569
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1398/1674	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.42	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	968/1674	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1423	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1061/1609	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	4	4	4	3	3.25	1364/1585	3.92	4.05	3.96	4.01	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	961/1535	4.33	4.33	4.08	4.18	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	2	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	524/1651	4.67	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1189/1673	4.44	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	955/1656	4.15	4.28	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1394/1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	1250/1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1181/1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1138/1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1217/1380	3.41	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	6	1	4	3.38	1230/1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	681/1515	4.72	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	685/1511	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	799/ 994	4.13	3.99	3.94	4.19	3.36	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	36/ 76	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.86	4.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	34/ 77	4.17	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.17	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	16

Course-Section: SOWK 481 8020
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II
 Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1570
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	829/1674	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	212/1609	4.58	4.48	4.22	4.30	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	722/1585	3.92	4.05	3.96	4.01	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	253/1535	4.33	4.33	4.08	4.18	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	351/1651	4.67	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1015/1673	4.44	4.73	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	451/1656	4.15	4.28	4.07	4.19	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	784/1586	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1582	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	612/1575	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.35	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	1	3	1	6	3.62	992/1380	3.41	4.05	3.94	4.04	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	173/1520	4.44	4.46	4.01	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	186/1515	4.72	4.61	4.24	4.40	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	219/1511	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.45	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	174/ 994	4.13	3.99	3.94	4.19	4.58	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.13	4.19	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						