

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0101
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1347
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	439/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1481	4.69	4.57	4.23	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1249	4.69	4.66	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1424	4.83	4.55	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396	4.25	4.20	3.98	3.94	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1342	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.05	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1459	4.92	4.67	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.18	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1409	4.80	4.71	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	823/1407	4.70	4.84	4.69	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	267/1399	4.79	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1400	4.63	4.62	4.27	4.34	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	152/1179	4.74	4.07	3.96	4.05	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	4.43	4.57	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	4.62	4.70	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	4.33	4.74	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	3.88	4.11	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0201
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1348
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1174/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	458/1481	4.69	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	4.69	4.66	4.27	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.83	4.55	4.21	4.28	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	918/1396	4.25	4.20	3.98	3.94	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	565/1342	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.05	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1459	4.92	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	761/1450	4.18	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1409	4.80	4.71	4.42	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.70	4.84	4.69	4.78	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1399	4.79	4.64	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1400	4.63	4.62	4.27	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	134/1179	4.74	4.07	3.96	4.05	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.57	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259	4.62	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	754/1256	4.33	4.74	4.30	4.28	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	533/ 788	3.88	4.11	4.00	3.98	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LARSEN, KELLI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1349
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	1	2	0	0	5	3.75	1254/1481	4.09	4.41	4.29	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1481	4.69	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.69	4.66	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	318/1424	4.83	4.55	4.21	4.28	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396	4.25	4.20	3.98	3.94	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	649/1342	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.05	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/1459	4.92	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	880/1480	4.92	4.74	4.68	4.68	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1055/1450	4.18	4.29	4.09	4.15	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	762/1409	4.80	4.71	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1053/1407	4.70	4.84	4.69	4.78	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1399	4.79	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	969/1400	4.63	4.62	4.27	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	134/1179	4.74	4.07	3.96	4.05	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	816/1262	4.43	4.57	4.05	4.11	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	846/1259	4.62	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1055/1256	4.33	4.74	4.30	4.28	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	394/ 788	3.88	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	4.94	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.92	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	4.73	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.33	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 240 0301
 Title INFO TECH IN SOCIAL WO
 Instructor: LARSEN, KELLI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1349
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	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	20	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	80/1481	4.85	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1249	4.88	4.66	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	334/1424	4.59	4.55	4.21	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	193/1396	4.64	4.20	3.98	3.94	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	405/1342	4.49	4.38	4.07	4.05	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1459	4.79	4.67	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/1450	4.52	4.29	4.09	4.15	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1409	4.93	4.71	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	103/1399	4.89	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1400	4.90	4.62	4.27	4.34	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	187/1179	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.05	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	220/1262	4.79	4.57	4.05	4.11	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	304/1259	4.71	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	296/1256	4.84	4.74	4.30	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	335/ 788	4.22	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 59	****	4.94	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.92	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.73	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.33	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0101
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1350
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 35 Non-major 26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 260 0201
 Title INTRO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1351
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	1	0	3	25	4.79	244/1481	4.80	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	228/1481	4.85	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	245/1249	4.88	4.66	4.27	4.36	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	364/1424	4.59	4.55	4.21	4.28	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	5	22	4.62	225/1396	4.64	4.20	3.98	3.94	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	251/1342	4.49	4.38	4.07	4.05	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	367/1459	4.79	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	319/1450	4.52	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	261/1409	4.93	4.71	4.42	4.47	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	400/1407	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	170/1399	4.89	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	117/1400	4.90	4.62	4.27	4.34	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	1	4	7	14	4.19	495/1179	4.41	4.07	3.96	4.05	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	150/1262	4.79	4.57	4.05	4.11	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	499/1259	4.71	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	232/1256	4.84	4.74	4.30	4.28	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	1	11	9	4.27	282/ 788	4.22	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.27	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 15	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: SOWK 260H 0201
 Title INTRO TO SOCIAL WORK I
 Instructor: WALSH, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1352
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.57	4.23	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.55	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.20	3.98	3.94	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.38	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.67	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.71	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	4.07	3.96	4.05	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.57	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 360 0101
 Title SOC WELFARE/POL/WORK I
 Instructor: TICE, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1353
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	2	0	7	15	4.46	613/1481	4.48	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	469/1481	4.61	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	498/1249	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	645/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	355/1396	4.45	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	11	9	4.26	534/1342	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	611/1459	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	928/1480	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	334/1450	4.36	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	169/1409	4.80	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	450/1407	4.79	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	431/1399	4.53	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	312/1400	4.71	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	13	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	1011/1179	3.50	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	279/1262	4.61	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	391/1259	4.62	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	438/1256	4.76	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	3	2	1	7	7	3.65	568/ 788	3.69	4.11	4.00	4.07	3.65	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 32 Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	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 21	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1354
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	718/1481	4.48	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	560/1481	4.61	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	219/1249	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	473/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	411/1396	4.45	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	444/1342	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	253/1459	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	918/1450	4.36	4.29	4.09	4.10	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	603/1409	4.80	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1053/1407	4.79	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	920/1399	4.53	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	571/1400	4.71	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	2	4	4	4	3.53	883/1179	3.50	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	437/1262	4.61	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	624/1259	4.62	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	382/1256	4.76	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	3	1	5	1	4	3.14	705/ 788	3.69	4.11	4.00	4.07	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	4.94	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.92	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.73	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.33	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1354
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	18				
				?	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	2	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	450/1481	4.48	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	183/1481	4.61	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	357/1249	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	364/1424	4.46	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	280/1396	4.45	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	230/1342	4.41	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	189/1459	4.62	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	928/1480	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	238/1450	4.36	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	275/1409	4.80	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	545/1407	4.79	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	212/1399	4.53	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	208/1400	4.71	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	2	4	0	10	3.78	780/1179	3.50	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	182/1262	4.61	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	461/1259	4.62	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	248/1256	4.76	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	1	1	1	14	4.26	287/ 788	3.69	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.26	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	4.94	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.92	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.73	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.33	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 14
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	0			

Course-Section: SOWK 387 0101
 Title POL/PROG/SERV:CHILDREN
 Instructor: SMELSER, PAMELA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1356
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	2	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	479/1249	4.53	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	326/1424	4.62	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	519/1396	4.24	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	8	12	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	0	0	7	13	4.48	505/1459	4.48	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.74	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.71	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	65/1399	4.95	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	73/1400	4.95	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	190/1262	4.78	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	276/1259	4.83	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	506/1256	4.61	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 788	****	4.11	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0101
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: WIECHELT, SHELL
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1357
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	918/1481	4.36	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	917/1481	4.26	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	346/1249	4.59	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	740/1424	4.38	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	1054/1396	3.78	4.20	3.98	4.00	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	725/1342	4.15	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	460/1459	4.55	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	839/1480	4.78	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	8	6	4	3.78	1081/1450	4.09	4.29	4.09	4.10	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	7	5	8	4.05	1137/1409	4.42	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	1184/1407	4.66	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	1002/1399	4.43	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	10	4	3.80	1120/1400	4.28	4.62	4.27	4.28	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	4	5	5	5	3.45	919/1179	3.98	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	7	9	4.21	596/1262	4.51	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	432/1259	4.79	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	382/1256	4.84	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	650/ 788	3.99	4.11	4.00	4.07	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: Mays, Maria
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1358
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	531/1481	4.36	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	704/1481	4.26	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	1	0	2	4	18	4.52	479/1249	4.59	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	437/1424	4.38	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	2	7	11	4.00	707/1396	3.78	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	542/1342	4.15	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	1	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	344/1459	4.55	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	1	0	0	2	21	4.75	880/1480	4.78	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	1	0	10	11	4.41	473/1450	4.09	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	350/1409	4.42	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	450/1407	4.66	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	162/1399	4.43	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	312/1400	4.28	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	259/1179	3.98	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	167/1262	4.51	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	211/1259	4.79	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	108/1256	4.84	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	3	0	17	4.57	159/ 788	3.99	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.94	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.92	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.73	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.33	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 388 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: Mays, Maria
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1358
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	35	Non-major	23
84-150	0	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	18				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1359
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	1	11	3	5	3.36	1398/1481	3.80	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	3	8	9	2	3.45	1342/1481	3.93	4.57	4.23	4.23	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	3	6	7	6	3.73	1061/1249	4.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	4	9	5	3.68	1218/1424	3.97	4.55	4.21	4.27	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	3	2	9	4	3.50	1083/1396	3.68	4.20	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	6	6	4	3.33	1186/1342	3.79	4.38	4.07	4.12	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	4	3	7	7	3.81	1125/1459	4.13	4.67	4.16	4.17	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	1171/1480	4.32	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	1	8	6	1	3.17	1329/1450	3.74	4.29	4.09	4.10	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	2	11	5	3.76	1248/1409	4.30	4.71	4.42	4.43	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	7	13	4.48	1130/1407	4.65	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	6	8	5	3.71	1178/1399	4.12	4.64	4.26	4.27	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1211/1400	4.08	4.62	4.27	4.28	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	487/1179	3.85	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	457/1262	4.34	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	532/1259	4.43	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	438/1256	4.47	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	4	2	11	4.22	304/ 788	3.56	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 19

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 389 0201
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: MOSES, JAMAAL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1360
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	2	11	1	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	0	8	5	4.07	975/1481	3.93	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	5	2	6	3.80	1022/1249	4.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1160/1424	3.97	4.55	4.21	4.27	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1065/1396	3.68	4.20	3.98	4.00	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	2	7	3	3.79	968/1342	3.79	4.38	4.07	4.12	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	520/1459	4.13	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.32	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	781/1450	3.74	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	891/1409	4.30	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	728/1407	4.65	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	753/1399	4.12	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	704/1400	4.08	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	894/1179	3.85	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	550/1262	4.34	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	532/1259	4.43	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	571/1256	4.47	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	773/ 788	3.56	4.11	4.00	4.07	2.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 5
84-150	4	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 13	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SOWK 389 8020
 Title HUMAN BEHAVIOR II
 Instructor: SKIBA, DAVID
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1361
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	4	11	10	4.24	870/1481	3.80	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	13	10	4.28	790/1481	3.93	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	523/1249	4.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	545/1424	3.97	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	11	8	4.00	707/1396	3.68	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	542/1342	3.79	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	5	5	12	4.13	890/1459	4.13	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	959/1480	4.32	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	12	3	3.95	918/1450	3.74	4.29	4.09	4.10	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	417/1409	4.30	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	963/1407	4.65	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	763/1399	4.12	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	844/1400	4.08	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	1	5	8	9	3.84	732/1179	3.85	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	497/1262	4.34	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	851/1259	4.43	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	797/1256	4.47	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	382/ 788	3.56	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.05	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 28	Non-major 10
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 17		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SOWK 390F 0101
 Title PEER EDUCATORS PROJECT
 Instructor: HARVEY, ALISON
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1362
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.57	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.67	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.71	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.64	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.70	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.11	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SOWK 390K 0101
 Title SOWK PRAC RELAT PHYS I
 Instructor: HARRIS, JESSE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1363
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SOWK 390P 8020
 Title CASE MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1364
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	218/1481	4.82	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	128/1481	4.88	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	419/1396	4.35	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	91/1342	4.88	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	189/1459	4.76	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	729/1480	4.88	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	494/1450	4.38	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1409	4.94	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	195/1399	4.82	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	444/1400	4.65	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	218/1179	4.59	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	158/1262	4.82	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	127/1259	4.94	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	130/1256	4.94	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	264/ 788	4.31	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.94	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.92	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.73	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.33	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 390P 8020
 Title CASE MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1364
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: SKIBA, DAVID
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1365
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	328/1481	4.39	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	210/1481	4.58	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	334/1249	4.81	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	287/1424	4.52	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	269/1396	4.28	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	148/1342	4.65	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	402/1459	4.78	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.83	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	334/1450	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	217/1409	4.74	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	545/1407	4.91	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	245/1399	4.78	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	287/1400	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	384/1179	4.27	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	236/1262	4.75	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	325/1259	4.84	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	256/1256	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	347/ 788	4.38	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0301
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: KNIGHT, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1366
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	729/1481	4.39	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	758/1481	4.58	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	278/1249	4.81	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	762/1424	4.52	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	451/1396	4.28	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	206/1342	4.65	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	155/1459	4.78	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1029/1480	4.83	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	417/1450	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	1007/1409	4.74	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.91	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	431/1399	4.78	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	0	13	4.53	571/1400	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1179	4.27	4.07	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	220/1262	4.75	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1259	4.84	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	357/1256	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	324/ 788	4.38	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 397 0401
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: MOELLER, DITTE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1367
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	2	7	3.58	1334/1481	4.39	4.41	4.29	4.29	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	632/1481	4.58	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1249	4.81	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	533/1424	4.52	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	4	6	3.53	1071/1396	4.28	4.20	3.98	4.00	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	333/1342	4.65	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	61/1459	4.78	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	715/1480	4.83	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	567/1450	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	275/1409	4.74	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	636/1407	4.91	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	178/1399	4.78	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	571/1400	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	651/1179	4.27	4.07	3.96	4.02	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	197/1262	4.75	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	229/1259	4.84	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	133/ 788	4.38	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: SOWK 397 8020
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1368
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	159/1481	4.39	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	176/1481	4.58	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	14	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.81	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	201/1424	4.52	4.55	4.21	4.27	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	156/1396	4.28	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	130/1342	4.65	4.38	4.07	4.12	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	161/1459	4.78	4.67	4.16	4.17	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	351/1480	4.83	4.74	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	139/1450	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	94/1409	4.74	4.71	4.42	4.43	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	250/1407	4.91	4.84	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	162/1399	4.78	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	187/1400	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	238/1179	4.27	4.07	3.96	4.02	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	190/1262	4.75	4.57	4.05	4.14	4.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	294/1259	4.84	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	216/1256	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	171/ 788	4.38	4.11	4.00	4.07	4.52	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.94	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.92	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.73	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.33	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 397 8020
 Title SOCIAL WORK METHODS I
 Instructor: MORRIS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1368
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	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	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	225/1481	4.42	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	135/1481	4.64	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.85	4.66	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	148/1424	4.79	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	355/1396	4.06	4.20	3.98	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	190/1342	4.60	4.38	4.07	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	344/1459	4.67	4.67	4.16	4.25	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	825/1480	4.68	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	403/1450	4.49	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	246/1409	4.63	4.71	4.42	4.51	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1407	4.92	4.84	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	90/1399	4.75	4.64	4.26	4.36	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	102/1400	4.65	4.62	4.27	4.38	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1179	3.81	4.07	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	88/1262	4.74	4.57	4.05	4.33	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	148/1259	4.85	4.70	4.29	4.57	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	248/1256	4.83	4.74	4.30	4.60	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	95/ 788	4.46	4.11	4.00	4.26	4.79	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	25/ 59	4.94	4.94	4.30	4.93	4.89	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.56	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 36	4.92	4.92	4.60	4.91	4.83	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	17/ 41	4.73	4.73	4.26	4.72	4.80	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 31	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	14
?	1		

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1370
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	395/1481	4.42	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	169/1481	4.64	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	4.85	4.66	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	144/1424	4.79	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	4	1	10	4.06	675/1396	4.06	4.20	3.98	4.09	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	190/1342	4.60	4.38	4.07	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	217/1459	4.67	4.67	4.16	4.25	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1158/1480	4.68	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	164/1450	4.49	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	670/1409	4.63	4.71	4.42	4.51	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.92	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	195/1399	4.75	4.64	4.26	4.36	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	239/1400	4.65	4.62	4.27	4.38	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	793/1179	3.81	4.07	3.96	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1262	4.74	4.57	4.05	4.33	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1259	4.85	4.70	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1256	4.83	4.74	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	254/ 788	4.46	4.11	4.00	4.26	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 59	4.94	4.94	4.30	4.93	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.56	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 36	4.92	4.92	4.60	4.91	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	19/ 41	4.73	4.73	4.26	4.72	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	21/ 31	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.83	4.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0201
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: BEMBRY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1370
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SOWK 483 0301
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: TING, LAURA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1371
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	6	8	10	14	3.84	1199/1481	4.42	4.41	4.29	4.45	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	2	14	18	4.21	865/1481	4.64	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	32	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1249	4.85	4.66	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	248/1424	4.79	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	6	14	10	3.58	1042/1396	4.06	4.20	3.98	4.09	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	4	6	24	4.44	364/1342	4.60	4.38	4.07	4.21	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	32	4.74	210/1459	4.67	4.67	4.16	4.25	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	421/1480	4.68	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	6	8	16	4.19	702/1450	4.49	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	10	22	4.42	865/1409	4.63	4.71	4.42	4.51	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	861/1407	4.92	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	6	26	4.53	545/1399	4.75	4.64	4.26	4.36	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	12	20	4.39	729/1400	4.65	4.62	4.27	4.38	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	14	10	10	3.78	780/1179	3.81	4.07	3.96	4.07	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	4	26	4.50	345/1262	4.74	4.57	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	0	32	4.72	391/1259	4.85	4.70	4.29	4.57	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	2	30	4.72	394/1256	4.83	4.74	4.30	4.60	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	4	6	12	14	4.00	394/ 788	4.46	4.11	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	****/ 59	4.94	4.94	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/ 51	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 36	4.92	4.92	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/ 41	4.73	4.73	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 31	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 24	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	8	C 0	General 0
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 34
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: SOWK 483 8020
 Title SOCIAL WORK MEHTODS II
 Instructor: MCFEATERS, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1372
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	718/1481	4.42	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	361/1481	4.64	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.85	4.66	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	263/1424	4.79	4.55	4.21	4.35	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	564/1396	4.06	4.20	3.98	4.09	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	214/1342	4.60	4.38	4.07	4.21	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1459	4.67	4.67	4.16	4.25	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	974/1480	4.68	4.74	4.68	4.74	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	296/1450	4.49	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	603/1409	4.63	4.71	4.42	4.51	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	4.92	4.84	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	300/1399	4.75	4.64	4.26	4.36	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	647/1400	4.65	4.62	4.27	4.38	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	692/1179	3.81	4.07	3.96	4.07	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	279/1262	4.74	4.57	4.05	4.33	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	391/1259	4.85	4.70	4.29	4.57	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	394/1256	4.83	4.74	4.30	4.60	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	114/ 788	4.46	4.11	4.00	4.26	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	4.94	4.94	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	4.92	4.92	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	4.73	4.73	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	4.33	4.33	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 6
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant