

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0101  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1461  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	541/1576	4.54	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	187/1576	4.76	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	429/1520	4.64	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	483/1465	4.33	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	345/1434	4.60	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	280/1547	4.81	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	662/1554	4.44	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1488	4.96	4.75	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1489	4.84	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	181/1277	4.76	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	568/1279	4.54	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	478/1270	4.70	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	511/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	175/ 878	4.24	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.64	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 375	4.97	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 382	4.97	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8620  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1463  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: SOWK 240 8620  
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1463  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1464  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	243/1576	4.51	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	152/1576	4.62	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	209/1342	4.62	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	197/1520	4.48	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	127/1465	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	252/1434	4.48	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	527/1547	4.40	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1079/1574	4.63	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	316/1554	4.16	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1488	4.76	4.75	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	339/1486	4.72	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	251/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	194/1277	4.65	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	477/1279	4.45	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	763/1270	4.43	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	409/1269	4.68	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	193/ 878	4.44	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/ 375	4.98	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/ 326	4.98	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	69/ 382	4.98	5.00	4.08	4.39	4.97

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: CHAKMAKIAN, ELI  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1464  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1465  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	988/1576	4.51	4.56	4.30	4.35	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	851/1576	4.62	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	726/1342	4.62	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	945/1520	4.48	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	718/1465	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	670/1434	4.48	4.58	4.14	4.06	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	794/1547	4.40	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.63	4.78	4.64	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1187/1554	4.16	4.38	4.10	4.05	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	846/1488	4.76	4.75	4.47	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.95	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	437/1486	4.72	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	474/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	258/1277	4.65	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	532/1279	4.45	4.62	4.17	4.14	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	636/1270	4.43	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	602/1269	4.68	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	350/ 878	4.44	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	55/ 375	4.98	4.99	4.01	4.21	4.96
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	53/ 326	4.98	4.99	4.03	4.43	4.96
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 382	4.98	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201  
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1465  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0201  
 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I  
 Instructor: BAFFOUR, TIFFAN  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1466  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.56	4.30	4.35	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.70	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.69	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.35	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	4.58	4.14	4.06	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.68	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.38	4.10	4.05	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.75	4.47	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.91	4.73	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.76	4.32	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.62	4.17	4.14	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.72	4.35	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.81	4.35	4.29	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.32	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0201  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1467  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	1	3	36	4.80	243/1576	4.83	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	4	34	4.76	279/1576	4.85	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	143/1342	4.91	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.93		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	2	36	4.82	185/1520	4.81	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	5	31	4.61	304/1465	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	6	33	4.73	209/1434	4.79	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	4	35	4.80	186/1547	4.82	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	14	25	4.64	942/1574	4.82	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	0	1	4	23	4.66	272/1554	4.69	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	167/1493	4.99	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	137/1486	4.91	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	6	33	4.85	263/1489	4.87	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	2	1	3	31	4.70	187/1277	4.52	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	184/1279	4.91	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1270	4.89	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	342/1269	4.84	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	8	1	17	4.22	383/ 878	4.58	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	45	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	46	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 360 8620  
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I  
 Instructor: PLANELL, JOAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1468  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	203/1576	4.83	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	91/1576	4.85	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	185/1342	4.91	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	218/1520	4.81	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	15	4.47	410/1465	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	134/1434	4.79	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	160/1547	4.82	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.82	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	215/1554	4.69	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	339/1488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	4.99	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	181/1486	4.91	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	205/1489	4.87	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	1	0	12	4.33	463/1277	4.52	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	101/1279	4.91	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	378/1270	4.89	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	342/1269	4.84	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	81/ 878	4.58	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.93	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	18				
				? 0						

Course-Section: SOWK 372 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR  
 Instructor: HARRIS, JESSE  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1469  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	8	0	0	3	2	3	8	4.00	1148/1576	4.28	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	1058/1576	4.28	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	552/1342	4.49	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1012/1520	4.03	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	6	2	5	3.60	1208/1465	3.80	4.35	4.12	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	6	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	360/1434	4.34	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1247/1547	4.18	4.68	4.19	4.21	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1405/1574	4.57	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.06	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1233/1488	4.31	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	4.94	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	871/1486	4.68	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	867/1489	4.57	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	2	1	0	0	5	3.63	963/1277	4.15	4.43	4.03	4.11	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	774/1279	4.42	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	686/1270	4.54	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	559/1269	4.69	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.24	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 372 8620  
 Title SOCIAL WORK & HLTH CAR  
 Instructor: ROCKWOOD, JANE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1470  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.28	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	698/1576	4.28	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	658/1342	4.49	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.03	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	850/1465	3.80	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	816/1434	4.34	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	387/1547	4.18	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	4.57	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.06	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	722/1488	4.31	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.94	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	4.68	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	350/1489	4.57	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	215/1277	4.15	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	262/1279	4.42	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	541/1270	4.54	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	444/1269	4.69	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 878	4.24	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 387 0101  
 Title POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN  
 Instructor: DEMIDENKO, MICH  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1471  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	2	19	4.90	163/1576	4.90	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	152/1576	4.90	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	90/1342	4.95	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	138/1520	4.90	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	110/1434	4.90	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.68	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1398/1574	4.14	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	307/1554	4.62	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	172/1486	4.90	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	97/1489	4.95	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	130/1270	4.95	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	197/ 878	4.58	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.58	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1472  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	595/1576	4.53	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	364/1576	4.69	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	500/1342	4.59	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	1	5	4	20	4.43	631/1520	4.43	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	468/1465	4.43	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	7	18	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	375/1547	4.63	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	12	17	4.53	834/1488	4.53	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	4	8	18	4.47	735/1486	4.47	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	16	2	1	3	1	6	3.62	968/1277	3.62	4.43	4.03	4.11	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	696/1270	4.45	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	6	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.32	4.05	4.09	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1472  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						



Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1473  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	952/1576	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	798/1576	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	455/1342	4.84	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	792/1520	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	537/1465	4.49	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	305/1434	4.70	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	641/1547	4.73	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	7	0	3.54	1292/1554	4.24	4.38	4.10	4.09	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.87	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1029/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	530/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	696/1489	4.68	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	692/1277	4.45	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	3	1	3	7	3.80	938/1279	4.47	4.62	4.17	4.20	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.80	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	467/1269	4.91	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	538/ 878	4.10	4.32	4.05	4.09	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0101  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1473  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1474  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	324/1576	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1576	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1342	4.84	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	357/1520	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	513/1465	4.49	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	209/1434	4.70	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	86/1547	4.73	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1317/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.24	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.87	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	614/1489	4.68	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1277	4.45	4.43	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	373/1279	4.47	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	208/1270	4.80	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1269	4.91	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	580/ 878	4.10	4.32	4.05	4.09	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1474  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 389 8620  
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II  
 Instructor: THIEL, MINDY  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1475  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	347/1576	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	215/1576	4.71	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	90/1342	4.84	4.69	4.32	4.30	4.95		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	281/1520	4.56	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	251/1465	4.49	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	218/1434	4.70	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	179/1547	4.73	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1574	4.73	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	208/1554	4.24	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1488	4.87	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	97/1489	4.68	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	105/1277	4.45	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1279	4.47	4.62	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	412/1270	4.80	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1269	4.91	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	214/ 878	4.10	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.53	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101  
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT  
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1476  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	3	4.75	301/1576	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.66	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.75	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.46	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.88	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	4.93	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.74	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.62	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0102  
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT  
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1477  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	6	4.86	203/1576	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.70	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	429/1520	4.66	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	4.75	4.35	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	498/1434	4.46	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1547	4.88	4.68	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.93	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	924/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.92	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.76	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.74	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.62	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.72	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.32	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1478  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	3	6	12	4.32	882/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	811/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	17	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	597/1520	4.68	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	6	9	3.91	989/1465	4.23	4.35	4.12	4.09	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	398/1434	4.66	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	690/1547	4.67	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1025/1574	4.84	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	692/1554	4.54	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	1025/1488	4.71	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.89	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	911/1486	4.62	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	350/1489	4.78	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	15	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1277	4.37	4.43	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	413/1279	4.64	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	307/1270	4.78	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	511/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	2	0	6	9	4.29	344/ 878	4.49	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.75	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.67	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.90	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.49	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	



Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1478  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

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	1	5	18	4.71	359/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	392/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	18	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	161/1520	4.68	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	647/1465	4.23	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	323/1434	4.66	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	173/1547	4.67	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1574	4.84	4.78	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	355/1554	4.54	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	309/1488	4.71	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	868/1493	4.89	4.91	4.73	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	4	18	4.65	484/1486	4.62	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	420/1489	4.78	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	3	0	0	6	13	4.18	593/1277	4.37	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	373/1279	4.64	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	401/1270	4.78	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	278/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	283/ 878	4.49	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 17

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

Course-Section: SOWK 397 8620  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I  
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1480  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	16	4.78	277/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	256/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.28	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1342	****	4.69	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	281/1520	4.68	4.59	4.25	4.25	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	353/1465	4.23	4.35	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	122/1434	4.66	4.58	4.14	4.15	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	228/1547	4.67	4.68	4.19	4.21	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.84	4.78	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	173/1554	4.54	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	278/1488	4.71	4.75	4.47	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	4.89	4.91	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	191/1486	4.62	4.76	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	274/1489	4.78	4.74	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	283/1277	4.37	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	262/1279	4.64	4.62	4.17	4.20	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	435/1270	4.78	4.72	4.35	4.42	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	409/1269	4.80	4.81	4.35	4.41	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	133/ 878	4.49	4.32	4.05	4.09	4.79	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1481  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.58	4.14	4.30	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	445/1547	4.58	4.68	4.19	4.24	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	672/1554	4.29	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.91	4.73	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	221/1486	4.85	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	637/1489	4.55	4.74	4.32	4.38	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	123/1277	4.83	4.43	4.03	4.04	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	350/1279	4.65	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	620/1270	4.53	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	596/1269	4.59	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	3	0	2	2	8	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	4.32	4.05	4.33	3.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1482  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	2	10	4.83	219/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	316/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1434	4.78	4.58	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1547	4.78	4.68	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	345/1270	4.88	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.94	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	175/ 878	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	4.64	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 326	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0201  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1483  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

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	2	15	4.88	179/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	91/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	149/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	290/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1434	4.78	4.58	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	173/1547	4.78	4.68	4.19	4.24	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	124/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	869/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1270	4.88	4.72	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269	4.94	4.81	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	133/ 878	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	4.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.77	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	43/ 79	4.80	4.80	4.69	4.69	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	138/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	4.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 44	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.60	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	26/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.57	4.34	4.57	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	79/ 326	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	4.94	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
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	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

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	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	665/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	571/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	296/1434	4.78	4.58	4.14	4.30	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	110/1547	4.78	4.68	4.19	4.24	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	758/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	339/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	500/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	791/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	214/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	345/1270	4.88	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.94	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	187/ 878	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	4.60
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	37/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	33/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 44	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.60	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	32/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.57	4.34	4.40
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	136/ 326	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	4.82
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 8620  
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS II  
 Instructor: OKUNDAYE, JOSHU  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1485  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	1027/1576	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.46	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	759/1576	4.75	4.70	4.27	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	972/1342	4.58	4.69	4.32	4.46	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	339/1520	4.70	4.59	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1012/1465	4.35	4.35	4.12	4.22	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	398/1434	4.78	4.58	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	718/1547	4.78	4.68	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.85	4.78	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	532/1554	4.70	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	995/1488	4.79	4.75	4.47	4.55	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	784/1493	4.93	4.91	4.73	4.80	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	642/1486	4.79	4.76	4.32	4.41	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	813/1489	4.77	4.74	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	3.73	4.43	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	262/1279	4.85	4.62	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.72	4.35	4.53	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	194/1269	4.94	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	692/ 878	4.40	4.32	4.05	4.33	3.58	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.80	4.80	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.99	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	4.90	4.90	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	4.49	4.49	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	92/ 326	4.92	4.99	4.03	3.97	4.93	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



I	0	Other	13
?	0		